A PAGE FROM HISTORY

Essays on History, Politics & Culture

Mubarak Ali

FICTION HOUSE

Contents

The Turks

The Arabs conquered Central Asia in the 9th century. This caused the slow and gradual conversion of Turkish tribes to Islam who subsequently produced loyal slaves, brave soldiers and energetic, capable rulers to serve the Muslim society. But who were these Turks?

According to historian Andre Wink, the very word Turk appears as the name of Central Asian nomad people only from the 6th century. The Chinese called them *Tukueh*, the Greeks *Tourkoi*, the Arabs *Atrak*, Persians *Turkan*, and the Indians *Turushka*. Interestingly, theirs was a very negative image by the ethnic groups and nations, who encountered them.

There are reasons for the shaping of such an image among the hostile rivals. As slaves, their social status was low, as soldiers they were mercenaries and as rulers, they were regarded as usurpers.

For example, their first appearance in the Muslim society as a group was of slaves. In hierarchical society, the status of slave was very low and they are contemptuously referred to in the contemporary literature as fools. They earned some respect when as slaves they were employed as personal guard of the Abbasid caliphs. These slave soldiers remained loyal to the caliphs as long as they were powerful but during the declining period they became famous for their notoriety and for their role as kingmakers. That is why we find a negative image of the Turks in the Abbasid chronicles.

The image was further maligned by the Iranians who had deep-rooted prejudice and hostility against the Turks in the pre-Islamic period. The Iranians regarded themselves as the most civilized and cultured while the Turks were looked as crude, cruel, and barbarians. Combined Arabian and Iranian prejudice portrayed the Turks as the creators of *fitna* (trouble) and killer of the caliphs.

Tayeb El-Hibri in his book *Reinterpreting Islamic Historiography* writes: "Among the various communities that made up the ummah, no group receives as hostile a treatment as the Turks do. A visible Persian bias in the Islamic narratives insured a bad name for the Turks, and this kept adjusting the changing role of the historical villains to stay with the Turks."

In the second stage, the Turks emerged as conquerors and rulers. They conquered India in the 11th and 13th centuries and their image, which emerged in the Sanskrit literature and inscriptions that are scattered throughout India, is very negative. They are depicted as destroyers and marauders in one of the narratives as quoted by B. Chattopadhyaya in his book *Representing the Other*.

Turushka rule and results of their conquests are described as: "The temple in the land has fallen into neglect as worship in them has been stopped. Within their walls the frightful howls of jackals have been taken place of the sweet reverberations of the *miri danga* (a musical instrument)... The sweet odour of the sacrificial smoke are now filled with the foul smell of roasted flesh and fierce noises of the ruffiantly Turushkas."

The West came to know about the Turks as a result of the Ottoman conquests of Constantinople and occupation of the Christian Balkan states. When Suleiman besieged Vienna in 1683, the Turkish peril appeared a serious threat to the West. A negative image of the Turks was propagated throughout Europe as barbaric warriors, and uncivilized hoarders.

H.A.L. Fisher, in his *History of Europe*, commenting on the Turks, writes: "The Turks have been barren of ideas, and retained until the present generation the modes of thought and life appropriate to nomads of the Asiatic highlands."

Even today, the Oxford Dictionary defines Turks as 'ferocious, wild or unmanageable person.'

In the modern Indian historiography, there are times when there is a discussion that whether the Muslim conquests of India were for Islam or for political interest.

Those who believe that the Muslim rulers such as Mahmud of Ghazna and Shahabuddin Ghori invaded India for

the sake of Islam, to them they were holy warriors who spread Islam and founded an Islamic state in India.

Interestingly, Syed Suleman Nadvi, a religious scholar, argued that the Turkish conquests of India were not for Islam because the invaders themselves were not well versed in Islamic teachings. They were newly converted people and still retained their un-Islamic ethnic tribal customs. On the other hand, the Arab conquest of Sindh was for Islam as the Arabs were pure Muslims and invaded Sindh for preaching Islam. Therefore, in his opinion, the North Indian conquests by the Turks were for worldly purposes and not for Islam. Khaliq Ahmad Nizami of Aligarh University later on repeated the same argument. He also rejected the argument that religion was the motive force for the Indian conquests; therefore, the Turkish conquerors were not holy warriors but mere aggressors.

However, both interpretations are different in their perspective.

Syed Suleiman Nadvi, by interpreting the conquest as politically motivated, wanted to protect the image of Islam from the deed of these conquerors who looted and plundered and massacred people. How a holy warrior could commit such atrocities? He declared them as not pure Muslims. Therefore, such acts of brutality were committed not in the name of Islam but for their vested interest as history shows that the resources of conquered land and looted wealth was used for their personal needs and not for common Muslims.

In the case of Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, his interpretation suits the secular India. Turkish conquerors were like other invaders who indulged in all sorts of crimes. They were Muslim in name only, otherwise their acts were not related to Islam. In this case they could be criticized and condemned. There is no need to glorify them and make them Muslim heroes.

Remembering Mahmud of Ghazna

In the decade of the 1920s, with the communalizing of politics, Indian historiography was also communalized. In the process of writing history, historians of both sides glorified their heroes and vilified the heroes of the other. In Mahmud of Ghazna (1968-1030), communalist Hindu historians found a savage and cruel man who brought disaster and destruction to India; plundered and looted the accumulated wealth of the royal treasuries and temples and reduced India to political chaos and financial crisis. His demolishing of temples and disgracing idols disrupted the religious life of the people. To them, he was scourge and a marauder who rendered irreparable loss to India.

The communalist Muslim historians, on the other hand, glorified his conquests and victories and attributed to him the title of 'idol-breaker'. M. Nazim, in his book, *The Life and Times of Mahmud of Ghazna*, admires him as a great general who was never defeated and who overpowered all difficulties and succeeded in his plans. Mahmud Shirani, in a number of his articles, refutes the charges against Mahmud of Ghazna that he betrayed the famous Persian poet, Firdousi, and paid him less than what he promised. He further argues that he is wrongly accused as greedy as he was generous and patronizing to scholars and literary people.

Muhammad Habib, in his book, *Mahmud of Ghaznin* analyses his role with a secular point of view. According to him, he was not interested in occupying conquered territories. On the contrary, his interest was to take wealth from India and invest it in building his empire in Central Asia. He also took along with him Indian craftsmen to beautify his capital of Ghazna, which soon became a centre of culture and hub of literary activities. In matters of religion, he was not fanatic but tolerant, and employed Indian soldiers to serve in his army. He incorporated Punjab in

his territories and made Lahore its capital, that soon transformed into an Islamic city where Ulema, scholars, poets and mystics came from all over Muslim world.

Mahmud, by establishing a vast and powerful empire, challenged the political power of the Caliph. As a result, there emerged differences between the Caliphate and the Sultanate. As Mahmud greatly strengthened the Sultanate, it subsequently reduced the power and authority of the Caliphate. This brought about a change in Muslim society and people shifted their loyalty from the Caliph to their Sultan, their defender and protector. It made the Caliph only a nominal head of the Muslim world. Once the Sultans became fully independent, they promoted the local culture and identity of their people. The result this phenomenon was that the Muslim world fragmented and regional sovereignties established their hold on their people.

This political change resulted in the revival of Persian language and culture at the Ghaznavid court. It challenged the domination of the Arabic language. On the other hand, Persian became the literary and academic language, and Mahmud patronized it by inviting great literary figures and scholars to his court. Ibn Sina was the one who refused to oblige. Others came and served at his court and enjoyed his patronage.

The great Persian poet, Firdousi, reconstructed ancient legendary history of Persia in his *Shahnama* that became the bible of Persian nationalism. The nationalist movement of the Persians against Arab imperialism found a strong weapon in *Shahnama* to counter Arab culture and glorify Persian traditions. It ultimately cheeked the growth of Arab culture in Persian-speaking areas. The Indian-Muslim society also adopted Persian rather than Arab culture, as Islam came via Persia. On this account, the period of Mahmud of Ghazna is known as the renaissance of Persian language.

Mahmud's conquest of India also enabled Al-Beruni, the famous scholar, to come to India and study Indian culture and civilization. His *Kitab al-Hind* is the best and most authentic document to Indian religion, philosophy, customs and rituals. It created a bridge of understanding between India and the Muslim world. However, there is a lesson to be learnt from history: the great empire which was built by Mahmud of Ghazna collapsed

soon after his death, but the intellectual impact of the *Shamnama* and *Kitab al-Hind* survives even today.

During the British rule, to please the Hindus and to show their contempt for the Afghans, the British army brought back the doors of Somnath from Ghazna during the second Afghan war. But before installing these doors at the temple, it was found that they belong to a much later period. Perhaps, feeling ashamed and humiliated, the authorities put these doors in a cellar at Agra and never talked about them again. Recently, Romila Thapar wrote an excellent article on Somnath and has deconstructed the whole myth that was woven around it.

The Turkish Slaves

The foundation of the Turkish slave institution was laid during the Abbasid period. Ibn Khaldun, in his *Muqadimmah*, commenting on it wrote that the reason for relying on leaves by the Abbasid Caliphs was the lack of support from their own tribe, and loss their own tribe, and loss of the Arab spirit (Asabiyah) which was the backbone of their rule.

When the Persians assumed political power at the court and the Arabs relegated to the background, the Abbasid rulers looked to other options for their support base. Moreover, among other reasons were the expansion of the Empire, integration of different ethnic groups in the imperial structure, concentration of absolute power in the person of ruler, and ambitions of different claimants to the throne forced the reigning Caliph to have a group of soldiers on whom he could trust. The Turkish slaves fulfilled this object and earned respect and honour as protector of the Caliphate. However, they also disgraced themselves by creating anarchy and disorder when the caliphate was in a process of decline.

One should also remember that this institution in the later Abbasid period, emerged many prominent ruling dynasties such as the Tulunids (868-905) and the Akhshids (935-969), who played a very significant role in the Muslim history.

The slave institution of the Abbasids provided a model to the new emerging Muslim dynasties whose rulers used to keep slaves as their personal bodyguard and appointed them on high administrative posts. Ya'qub b. Laith (868-878) had nearly 2,000 slaves who served him as his personal servants and bodyguard. His brother 'Amar (878-900) had a practice to purchase boys slaves and trained them in various arts and crafts. He posted them in the army of his commanders where they acted as spies.

The Samanids (819-1005), the Qarakkhanids (922-1211), the Ghaznavids (977-1186), and the Ghorids (1000-1215)

followed the same tradition and used the institution for establishment and consolidation of their rule. The Turkish slaves became famous soldiers and administrators. They excelled in loyalty and faithfulness. As the number of slaves increased, they were divided into different categories according to merit. Beside general slaves, there were *Ghulaman i Khass* or *Ghulamana i Sultani* (slaves for the king) who acted as personal servants to sultan.

There were slave markets, scattered throughout the Eastern Empire where Turkish slaves were sold like any other commodity. After purchase, these slaves were trained in different arts. Once a slave entered the service of a sultan, he was appointed first on his personal services such as *Saqi i Khass* (royal cup bearer), *Chashnigir* (taster), *Tashtdar, Mash'aldar* (lamp bearer), and *jamadar* (keeper of wardrobe). If they showed talent and efficiency they were promoted to higher posts. The highest posts for them were the governor of a province or commander òf the royal forces.

The institution of slavery proved advantageous to the royal dynasties. It provided them talented and loyal slaves who protected them from external and internal enemies. But it also played a negative role. Once all political powers were concentrated in their class, they used it for their personal ends and ignored the interest of royal dynasty and the state. They remained loyal as long as the king was powerful. But when the weak ruler ascended the throne, they usurped all power and forced the king to follow their instructions.

Shahbuddin Ghori (1203-1206) brought the Turkish slaves to India. According to Minhaj Siraj, a contemporary historian "he had a great fancy for purchasing Turkish slaves and bought a great number of slaves of that race. Every one of them acquired fame throughout the whole of the countries of the East for activity, warlike accomplishments, and expertness."

His slaves helped him in conquering India and after his death laid down the foundation of the Slave Dynasty. Two rulers were themselves slaves and had no legitimacy for their rule, both of them heavily relied on the support of their slaves. Iltutmish (1211-1236) especially organized *Amir i Chihilga* or the 'Forty' to protect him for rivals. They remained loyal to Iltutmish but

after his death became turbulent and played the role of king makers. When Balban (1266-1287) became the king, he fully realized that he could enjoy full power only when the Forty would be annihilated. In his early days he was one of them and knew each member of the group and dealt accordingly. One by one all members were assassinated. He even did not spare his own cousin who was a member of the group.

Assessing the role of the Turkish slaves, it is evident that they caused political anarchy by undermining the authority of king, which subsequently weakened their own position by involving them in intrigues, and engaging them in fighting against each other. Their only concern was how to acquire more wealth. They failed to understand that the Sultanate was not stable and surrounded by aggressive Hindu states who were waiting for an opportunity to destroy it. Balban, as ruler, understood the problem and therefore ruthlessly broke their power. With the end of the Forty, the role of the Turkish slaves came to an end in India.

There is a lesson to be learnt here. If an institution accumulates powers and assumes supreme authority, it collapses with its own burden. Structure of a state requires balance of power and sharing with others. If one institute becomes large in size and becomes supreme, it invites its own destruction as other institutions and groups refuse to cooperate and help it at the time of crisis.

Turkish Conquest of Northern India

In the 11th and 12th centuries, northern India was invaded and conquered by the Turks that led to the establishment of rule of the Sultans of Delhi. Historians interpret the impact of these conquests differently. One group of historians regard the invasions, conquests and occupation a disaster and catastrophe for India because it disrupted the process of Indian history and interrupted the growth and development of Indian society.

As a result of conquests, according to them, a foreign element dominated the political, social and economic scene that deprived the Indians of the opportunity to play an active role in their own affairs. They became backward and relegated to the secondary position. Furthermore, wars and conflicts between the invaders and the defenders sapped their energies and depleted the population. India suffered heavily, culturally and spiritually.

On the other hand, some historians believe that foreign invasions and conquests shook the Indian society from its deep slumber and made it active to face new challenges. Facing the danger, they resisted the invaders and did not surrender without fighting bloody battles. This spirit of resistance created in them a new life to get out from their narrow outlook and widen their horizon.

Pointing out major changes, they argue that before the conquests, northern India was divided into petty states and ruled by small potentates who remained engaged in wars and conflicts with their rivals and wasted their resources and energies for nothing. One of the important results of the Turkish conquest was the building of an empire that ended these feudal lords and incorporated their states into a unified political system that guaranteed peace and stability.

The Turks brought alongwith them a new culture that soon transformed the society into a multi-cultured one. It gave

fresh blood to the society which was isolated and needed fresh example, so far, military service was restricted only to the Kshatriya, and the other caste was not allowed to bear arms. The Turkish conquest ended their monopoly and military service was opened to all castes.

As the new conquerors resided cities and kept their army in fortresses, there occurred an urban revolution that changed the whole fabric of society. New cities were built and old ones were improved and extended. This urban revolution, in the words of Muhammad Habib, a veteran Aligarh historian, brought tremendous changes in Indian society.

Those lower castes and untouchables who were not allowed to reside within the four walls of cities, were free to come and live along with the other castes. According to him, this policy strengthened the structure of cities and because of it, cities were able to resist any invasion. Moreover, city life provided enough opportunities to artisans and craftsmen to show their professional skills.

As royalty and nobility required expensive dresses, ornaments, jewellry, furniture and equipment for horses and elephants, these artisans were employed in royal *karkhanajat* (factories) and supplied the required commodities. Their economic prosperity made them respectable in society. A status that was denied to them for centuries.

When Persian became the court language, it reduced the importance of Sanskrit and the Brahman class who monopolized the knowledge of the language. They, after losing the royal patronage, turned to other professions and worked as writers and accountants on the shops of merchants and traders that greatly affected their social status. As Al-Beruni remarks that some of them, after Mahmud's invasion, migrated to Kashmir or to the Hindu states for royal patronage. These changes, however, reduced their influence on the Hindu society.

Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, in his book *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India during the 13th Century* writes that: From the 8th century onwards, India had lost all contacts with the outside world, and the Hindu scholar was 'set in rigidity like a concrete structure'. One great achievement of the Turkish conquest of northern India was the easing of tins isolation, and

the establishment of the international status of India in then known world.

As a result of building a strong center, construction of forts on strategic places, trade routes became safe and the Indian markets were flooded with foreign merchandise. Trade and commerce resulted in the development of a legal system and tariff regulations. When the Turkish sultans introduced their own currency, it monetised the economy and promoted internal and external trade and commerce.

Irfan Habis, a prominent historian, pointed out that as a result of the Turkish conquests, new technology was introduced that provided effective tools to the artisans that increased their productivity. As a result, lower castes raised their social status and demanded a dignified place in the society. The resistance of this conflict is evident in contemporary literature.

The elite and upper classes complain of the haughty attitude of the lowborn, who attempt to get respectable status in society. This conflict is fully reflected during the reign of Balban (1246-1287), who refused to appoint any lowborn on important administrative posts. However, once the process of change began, it became difficult to stop it. Therefore, the changes that the Turks brought transformed the Indian society with lasting effects.

Turkish Conquests in Indian History

There are different interpretations regarding the Turkish conquests and its subsequent rule in north India. The original sources of Sanskrit and Persian present two antithetical pictures of the Turkish invaders. The Persian chronicles, written at the court by official historians, eulogies the conquerors as heroes who fought wars for the cause of religion and crushed the power of the infidels. In these narrations, the warrior kings were supported by the spiritual power of the Sufi saints who helped them in getting divine support against the enemies. The infidels were defeated in spite of their overwhelming military power. Those killed were pronounced *shaheed* (martyrs) and the victors were named as *ghazis* (Holy warriors). All these wars were declared as *jihad*, fought for the glory of Islam.

The Sanskrit sources, on the other hand, refer to these conquests as disaster for their country and society. Interestingly, however, the invaders are not referred to as Muslims but by their ethnic origin such as Tajika, Turushka, and Gauri. The term *'Musalamana'* for them was first used in the 13th century. The image of the Turkish invaders, which emerges through these sources, is the image of warriors who massacred people, plundered the conquered territories and brutally treated the vanquished. Thus, Turushka represents a cruel, tyrant, bloodthirsty and merciless ethnic group. This representation of the Turkish invaders shows a gap between the newcomers and the locals, who, as it appears, did not reconcile with the political changes resulting from their defeat.

In the 1920s communalist historians from both Muslim and Hindu communities propounded their points of view based on the original sources of the medieval period. In the Muslim perception, the Muslims rule introduced advanced culture and civilization that changed the Indian society. However, instead of

concentrating their researches on the social and cultural aspects, they focus on the conquests and victories of the Muslim rulers and their achievements. They glorified the role of the conquerors such as Muhammad Bin Qasim, Mahmud Ghaznavi, and Shihabuddin Ghauri and refused to acknowledge the resistance of their Indian counterparts. The Hindu historians regarded the arrival of the Turkish aggressors as catastrophe to India. It is argued that the Turkish rule ended the continuity of the Indian civilization and the introduction of new elements polluted the whole environment.

K.M. Munshi in his forward to *The Age of Imperial Kannauj* writes: "The age begins with the repulse of the Arab invasions on the mainland of India in the beginning of the eight century · and ends with the fateful year AD 997, when Afghanistan passed into the hands of the Turks.

With this age, ancient India came to an end. At the turn of its last century, Sabuktigin and Mahmud came to power in Ghazni. Their lust, which found expression in the following decades, was to shake the very foundations of life in India, releasing new forces. They gave birth to medieval India. Till the rise of Hindu power in 18th century, India was to pass through a period of collective resistance."

They argue that the conquest of India was not as easy as it is described in the Persian historiography. The Arabs in Sindh and the Turks in North India faced stiff resistance. It took the Arab 73 years, from AD636 to AD711, to conquer Sindh and the Turks became successful only after 150 years to establish their rule. Their expansion and survival became possible once they controlled the resources of the Gangetic-Yamuna valley. However, after political defeat, the Indians boycotted the outsiders socially. Historians also point out that these Turkish invaders plundered the accumulated wealth of India from the conquered territories and temples.

There is another interpretation pointed out that the Turks were not the representatives of Islam. They were converted from heathenism to Islam just before the invasion to India and thus were not well versed in the teachings of Islam. They invaded India only for political and not religious reasons. They never preached Islam nor made any attempt to impose the *Shariat*.

Their model was the ancient Iranian king whose traditions were imitated by them with pride and gusto. Conversions happened due to the Sufi saints and as a result of commercial activities of the merchant and traders. The lower castes and artisans became Muslims to gain economic benefits and to raise their social status.

Historians of this school point out that the Turkish rule ended the feudalism and established a centralized government and a society that was based on multiculture. The period saw the establishment of cities, which promoted trade and commerce, and created an urban culture. It also opened military services for all castes and ended the monopoly of *kshatriyas*.

Irfan Habib's research focuses on the technological and economic changes of the period. Paper manufacturing revolutionized the intellectual and bureaucratic spheres of the society and promoted education and helped to document the activities. The coming of Persian wheel had great impact on irrigation and agriculture. The spinning wheel and bowstring devices promoted textile industry. Thus, the third interpretation argues that India did not suffer because of the Turkish rule but benefited from the new changes that made the society mobile and active. However, there was integration and assimilation on political and cultural sides. India broadened its worldview.

This interpretation deals with the impact that the Indian society as a whole experienced. It also separates religion from politics and analyzes those factors, which were connected to the common people. If history is read with this perspective, it gives broad and wider outlook to the readers to understand the process of history.

·Bhakhti Movement

In the 13th and 14th centuries   India   went through
social, cultural, religious and political changes. The Turkish rule
ended the small states and laid down the foundation of a
kingdom that politically united North India under a sultan.
Ulema, who came from different parts of the Muslim world tried
to create religious difference between Muslims and kafirs and
pressurized the rulers to implement the Shariat. Sufis of different
orders (Silsila) challenged the religious orthodoxy and preached
religious tolerance. With the establishment of the Turkish rule,
the Brahmans lost the patron rulers and retired to the
background. When Persian became court language, it reduced
the status of Sanskrit and with it the status of the Brahman priest
further lowered.

Moreover, the Indian society greatly changed as a result
of technology that was brought by the Turks along with them.
These new technological inventions improved agricultural
products and promoted new crafts that subsequently raised the
social status of artisan classes. The mobility of lower castes to
higher social ladder was not liked by the upper castes. That is
why the historian of the Sultanate period, Ziauddin Barani had
great contempt for them for them and the rulers not to appoint
them on higher posts.

The Bhakhti Movement of the 13th and 14th
centuries was the product of this milieu. Was it a voice of
the voiceless people and lower castes that challenged all
those customs and practices that were prejudiced to them or
it had some other motives?   Historians interpret it
differently. To some it was a movement to check the
conversion to Islam and reform the Hindu society from the
below, that it could face the challenges of a new religion.
On the other hand, it is said that it was an attempt to bring
the Muslims to the fold of Hinduism. K.N. Panikar, a
famous historian, looks at the movement as a balm on the

wounds which occurred as a result of the Muslim conquest on the body of India. Russian historians interpret it as revolt of people against feudalism. To some however, it was a movement to bring Hindus and Muslims together, abandoning all those beliefs and rituals that created a gulf between them.

The main characteristics of the Bhakhti Movements were: first, all its exponents belonged to the lower castes and were proud of it. It shows that there was mobility in the society and rigidity of the caste system was crumbling. Secondly, they challenged religious orthodoxy, formalism, religious rituals and authority of mullas and pandits. Their emphasis was direct relation with God without any mediation. Direct access to God required no religious affiliation. Love of God eliminates all prejudices and differences and brings people together irrespective of their caste, creed, and class. Thirdly, the leaders of the Movement adopted different genre of poetry to mobilize people. It was most effective and appealing methods in a society that was illiterate. They roamed from village to village and recited poems that preach devotion and love to God. Fourthly, they concentrated their efforts to the rural areas. Cities to them were den of corruption and greed. Therefore, they addressed to the common people and created in them spirit of endurance to face miseries and retain hope for salvation.

Bhakhti Movement was divided into two schools of thought Saguna and Nirguna.

Saguna believed that divine power should be worshiped in some form. Therefore, idol worship was adopted by its followers that led them to place of worship (temples) and recitation of divine books. Their main exponents were Sur Das, Tulsi Das, Mira bai, Chaitinya, and Vidhiyapi. In the end it was absorbed by the mainstream Hindu religion.

Nirguna, on the other hand, did not believe in worshiping God in any form. They neither went to places of worship nor did they observe any religious rituals. According to their teaching God was in every person and therefore, there was no need of any temple or mosque. As artisans, workers and small traders were its followers who

ridiculed bookish knowledge. Kabir, Rai Das, Akhu Bhagat, Charan Das and Dadu Diyal were its leaders.

By challenging religious orthodoxy and hypocrisy of priests, Hindus and Muslims alike, the Movement created tolerance in the Indian society and maintained harmony of contradictions of different religions. Though it rejected religious authority, it still emphasized its disciples to follow the Guru. However, the criticism is that it concentrated on the salvation of individual but no attempt was made to change society as a whole. Moreover, there was heavy reliance on God for salvation and belief that exploiters and oppressors would be punished by Him.

However, in Mharashtra, Bhakhti Movement that was popularized by Ram Das, created Maharashra Dharam. In the process he supported Shivaji in his struggle against the Mughals and found his own Empire. In Punjab, Guru Nanak, followed the Nirguna school of Bhakhti movement but gradually his successors abandoned it and militarized the Sikh community against the Mughals.

Though Bhakti Movement has become part of history, still resonance of its songs thrill people and take them away from bitterness and violence that they face in their daily lives to peace and harmony.

Kabir the Weaver

One of the most popular and beloved *bhagats* of the Bhakhti movement is Kabir whose poetry, out-passing all times and ages, still gives courage to the common people to challenge religious bigotry and extremism. Although he rejected all religions, he is owned by the Hindus who call him *bhakta*, to the Muslims he is a *pir*, and to the Kabirpanthis he is an avatar. To modern India he is a symbol of the Hindu-Muslim unity. A man who is portrayed as progressive, enlightened and secular. His tomb at Magahr was built by Nawab Bijli Khan in 1450 which is visited by his Muslim followers. Near the tomb is his *samadhi* where his Hindu disciples visit to get his blessing. Besides Hindus and Muslims, the Sikhs have deep reverence for him as well. His *Ashloks* are in the Granth sahib, their holy book. He has become a legend, and a symbol of defiance, a man for all seasons.

Kabir belonged to the caste of weavers, a low caste, which was converted to Islam but retained most of their past practices intact. That is why they were not included in the higher ladder of the Islamic society of India that was monopolized by the Sayyids and the Pathans as respectable and high castes. The Julahs were regarded fools and blockheads, as Kabir in one of his couplets says:

Kabir, that caste of mine is a joke to everyone: Blessed indeed be such a birth, that let me invoke the Creator.

Belonging to the Julaha community he must have faced discrimination, feelings of degradation and contempt for his profession and caste. This transformed him as a bitter critic to all forms of religion. He had contempt for *yogis, sadhus, sanyasis* and *mulvis* who eventually became a target for his sarcasm. Such was the reaction that he never donned an ascetic dress; neither put *tilak* on his forehead. Nor did he pretend to be a religious leader of any sort. His message was, and is:

The jogi cries: Gorakh, Gorakh! The Hindu invokes the Name of Ram, The Mussalman cries: Khuda is one! But the Lord of Kabir pervades all.

In Kabir's view, man can purify himself by rejecting all religions as they create hatred and prejudice in him. That is why he ridicules both Brahman as well as Shykh:

The Brahman is the Guru of the world, but he is not the devotees' Guru:

He got entangled in his four Vedas
And there he died.
If the Shaykh be devoid of patience,
Of what use is that Kaaba pilgrimage?
How can he whose soul is not firm can hope to reach God?

Like the priests of Christianity, he disliked the life of cities that was full of debauchery, greed, hypocrisy and corruption. Charlotte Vaudeville, the biographer of Kabir writes: "Highway robbery and house-breaking, petty larceny and pocket-picking, all kinds of knavery, roguery and cheating for which the ancient city of Kashi is particularly known (the famous Banarsi *thagi*), dice playing and gambling, the time honoured business of prostitution carried out in the open bazaar." Disgusted of it, he preferred life of villages where peasants were busy in tilling and watering the fields, drawing water through the well-known device called *arhat* or *rahat*...warding off birds all day when the crop is ready and keeping watch over it all night the endless toil of the Indian farmer." That is why Kabir addressed to the common people. He wandered from one village to another and recited his poetry which became quite popular in North India. He expressed the sentiments of simple folks who were oppressed and exploited not only politically but also religiously by rulers as well as priests and *mullas*. His scathing attack on the privileged classes and their religious observations and rituals exposed them to the people. His verses reduced them as clowns and buffoons.

O Miyan your order is not just: We are the poor servants of God and you just seek glory!

Allah is the master of Religion; He did not order to oppress the poor:

Your Murshid and your Pir, tell me, where did they come from?

You observe the Ramzan and you keep spelling prayers-
But the Kâlima won't earn you heaven: He who knows Him through the Experience,
His soul possesses seventy Kaabas.

It is the belief of the Hindus that if somebody dies at Kashi, a holy city, he would get immediate salvation. Kabir, sensing that his time had come, left Kashi to Magahr and died there. He defied all religious rituals in his lifetime. Even after his death he defied them. In spite of his rejecting all religions, he is claimed by the Hindus as well as the Muslims that he belonged to them. He left a rich heritage in form of poetry that still gives a voice to the voiceless.

(All translation of his verses are taken from Charlotte Vaudeville's "A Weaver name Kabir" 1993)

Tolerance vs Intolerance

If politics and religion go together, religion has to change itself according to the needs and challenges of time and adjust its teachings accordingly. In an enlightened and progressive society, such interpretations are accepted without any hesitation and prejudice. But a society which believes in the orthodoxy and purity of its religion refuses any interpretation which deviates from its original teachings. This is why politicians and religious leaders conflict with each other on the question of interpretation. However, the latter, having power and resources, either force or buy religious leaders to justify their acts on the basis of religion.

We can find a number of such examples in Muslim history when rulers asked jurists to find a solution to political problems which suited their political interest. For example, when the Muslim conquered Syria and Iraq, they found no problem in dealing with Christians and Jews as there were clear instruction to treat them as the 'people of the books'. However, when Persia was conquered they found people of different religions which raised the question of how to treat them.

The Muslim jurists adopted a pragmatic approach by declaring the Zoroastrians a people of the book like the Christians and Jews. On this basis, the conquerors imposed jizya on them and allowed them to practice their religion.

Later, when Muhammad b. Qasim conquered Sindh in 711, there he found Hindus and Buddhists, and the same question was raised: how to treat them? He wrote a letter to his mentor and governor of Basra, Hajjaj b. Yusuf, asking him solution about this problem. Hajjaj wrote a detailed letter (for the full text of the letter see, *Chuchnama* or *Fathnama*) advising him to treat the Hindus as people of the book and asked them to pay jizya. That was the model which was later on adopted by the Sultans of Delhi.

Neither were the Hindus forced by the rulers to convert nor were they persecuted and killed for not accepting Islam. The only objection against this policy was raised during the reign of Iltutmish by those ulema who took refuge in India as a result of the Mongols' occupation of Central Asia, their homeland.

A delegation of these ulema met the sultan and criticised his policy of treating the Hindus as a people of the book while they were unbelievers and as such either they should be forced to convert to Islam or they should be killed en masse on their refusal. Iltutmish asked his wazir to explain his point of view to the delegation.

The wazir, a shrewd politician, told the ulema that he agreed with their argument, but as there were not so many swords in the weaponry of the sultan to kill the whole Hindu population the alternative was to keep them in a state of humiliation. This satisfied the delegation and the same policy continued by the successive dynasties without any problem.

When Akbar succeeded to the Mughal throne he inherited this model of toleration in which the non-Muslim communities, after paying jizya, were allowed to observe their religious rituals and duties without much interference. However, we find some changes in this model from the earliest period of Akbar's reign.

It appears from historical evidence and also by his acts that he was not satisfied with the prevailing religious policy. His first marriage with a Rajput princess in 1561 shows his approach towards other religions. Unlike the rulers of the past, he did not ask his Rajput wife to change her religion and become a Muslim. On the contrary, she, remained a Hindu and continued to practice her religion in the royal harem without any prejudice or hindrance.

Akbar's policy of sulh-i-kul or peace with all had four ingredients on which he constructed and formulated it. The first important element was his concept of kingship, which is described by Abul Fazl (d. 1602) in Ain-i-Akbari as the highest dignity in the eyes of God. It is the light which emanates from Him. This creates paternal love for his subjects in the heart of the king. He does not allow sectarian differences to "raise the dust of strife." This concept of kingship made him king of all people

and not only the king of the Muslims. As such his duty was to eliminate all religious differences and treat all people religion with justice and equality.

This led to the second element of his policy to end religious discrimination. This gave a sense of equality to the Hindus and followers of other religions. To accomplish this he abolished the tax on the pilgrims of Mathura in 1563, and jizya in 1564. He also changed the policy of his predecessors, who appointed the Hindus only as clerks in the revenue department. He inducted them in the administration and high posts were awarded to them.

Todar Mal was assigned the post of Diwan; Raja Bhagwan Das and Man Singh became the trusted Mansabdar at the Mughal court. Birbal elevated to the position of confidence. Not only this, Akbar, in order to understand India and Hinduism, ordered the translation of their religious books into Persian.

Hindu festivals such as diwali, holi, and deschra were regularly celebrated at the court. Sometimes Akbar attended the court with a mark of tilak on his forehead. He prohibited the slaughter of cows and also adopted religious rituals of other religions such as Zoroastrianism, Christianity, Jainism, and Buddhism.

The third element of his policy was in the belief that all religions were true. Abul Fazl explaining it in the Ain-i-Akbari writes: "Each one regarding his persuasion alone as true has set himself for the persecution of other worshippers of God, and the shedding of their blood and ruining of reputations have become symbols of religious orthodoxy. Were the eyes of mind possessed of true vision, each individual would withdraw from this indiscriminating turmoil and attend rather to his own problems rather than interfere in concerns of others. If the doctrine of an enemy be in itself good, why should hands be stained in the blood of its professor? And even were it otherwise, the sufferer from the malady of folly deserves commiseration, not hostility and shedding of his blood."

Abul Fazl in one of his letters to Abdur Rahim Khankhanan writes: "not to look with contempt or enmity on the people who followed laws, different from his own." On behalf of Akbar he wrote to Shah Abbas, the king of Iran, "that divine

mercy attaches itself to every form of creed, and supreme exertions must be made to bring oneself into ever verbal flower garden of peace with all."

The fourth principle of his policy was to challenge everything and accept it on the basis of rationality. Again Abul Fazl explains it, "It becomes clear that a single step cannot be taken without the torch of proof and only that creed, to become circumcised and place one's head on the ground from dread of the sultan is not seeking after God."

Commenting on this model of Akbar, Eugenia Vanina, the authoress of "Ideas and Society in India" (1996) writes: "The main difference between the policies of Akbar and his predecessors lies in the paradox: they were tolerant while Akbar was not. For tolerance here means that some religions and ways of life were seen as 'wrong', but tolerated. Akbar on the other hand refused to distinguish between 'true' and 'wrong' religions, so his policy was not of a Muslim king's tolerance towards the kafirs but of respect towards all religions. This was a new policy not only for India, but for the whole of the medieval world, when for the first time all differences between the believers and kafirs were discarded."

The policy of sulh-i-kul which Akbar and Abul Fazl formulated not only strengthened the Mughal state but also eliminated religious discrimination by integrating all religious communities on the basis of equality. It is the model that we require today to implement it in our society torn by religious and sectarian strife.

Decline of the Mughals

In the 18th century when the process of decline started, the centre was losing its political and economic power but the provincial states were becoming powerful both economically and politically. The arrival of the European trading companies provided coastal Indian cities new opportunities to activate their commercial activities more vigorously. Trading communities flourished and were in a position to lend money to the kings and nobles.

Therefore, political decline did not co-relate with economic prosperity. Similarly, artisans, especially weavers continued to produce their goods for domestic and foreign markets. I agree with Abul Fazl that failure of the ruling class creates a gulf between the rulers and the common people. It is evident from history that if the ruling class accumulates all privileges and resources and leaves the people in poverty and misery, the end-result is disaster. And when the crisis deepens, people refuse to come to defend their ruling class. Getting this opportunity, I would like to elaborate my point of view further.

Decline and fall of civilizations, empires, nations, and royal dynasties is a phenomenon that attracts historians to probe, analyse, and discover laws that operate behind the scene. Within a civilization, there are also instances of rise and fall of empires, nations, and royal dynasties. As in the Islamic civilization for example, there emerged Abbasids, Ghaznavids, Safavids, Ottomans, and the Mughals and gradually declined. The Islamic civilization, however, sustained its decline and kept its vitality.

It ultimately fragmented in the eighteenth century. Since then, all efforts to revitalize it have failed.

Decline of the Mughal Empire is an interesting subject that has fascinated not only the modern historians but the contemporary historians. Narrators and men of letters have extensively written on it and, in some cases, even mourned the end of the Empire. Tragedy in history as well as in literature

appeals to the emotions of the people. That is why Gibbon's "Decline and fall of the Roman Empire" and Spangler's "Decline of the West" became classics. In the modern historiography William Irwin (1921-22) and Jadunath Sarkar (1932) are two historians who point out that incompetent and debauched rulers, intrigues at the court, conflicts among the nobility, widespread corruption among bureaucrats, assuming independence of Bengal, Awadh and their refusal to pay any revenue to the centre in the decades of 18th century, rebellions of Marathas, Jats, Sikhs, and Rajputs, and emergence of Afghan state of Farrukhabad and Rohelkhand which were not loyal to the Mughals were the causes which weakened the empire and led to its decline.

In 1950, a new school of historiography challenged these views and pointed out that the main cause of the decline was collapse of mansabdari and jagirdari systems. Satish Chandra and Athar Ali are of the view that the crisis of jagirdari occurred when Aurangzeb and his successors awarded the jagirs to expanding mansabdars to win their support. As the jagirs were limited, they were given from Khalsa (crown) land which consequently reduced the income of the emperor.

The jagirdars took advantage of the weakness of the emperor and on the one hand exploited the peasants while on the other hand refused to pay to the state treasury. Facing problems, peasants revolted against the exploitation and migrated to other places that financially and militarily affected the position of mansabdars. It subsequently broke the military and financial structure of the empire.

Irfan Habib's analysis is that the real cause of the jagirdari crisis was the frequent transfer of the jagirdar from one place to another. That is why he did not take interest in promotion of agriculture and well-being of the peasants. His only interest was to collect as much revenue as possible within short span of time. This policy resulted in continuous rebellions of peasants and subsequent weakness of jagirdari system.

The jagirdari crisis further deepened in the 18th century when, taking advantage of the weakness of the empire, jagirdars converted the status of their jagirs and made them as "Watan jagir" which became inheritable to their families. The situation

aggravated to this extent that if the emperor assigned somebody a jagir he could take over its control as the holder refused to vacate it. Only military power decided the cases, which provoked civil wars among the jagirdars. Another result of the crisis was that those mansabdars, who were paid in cash, became unemployed, as there were no resources in the state treasury to pay them.

The crisis of jagirdari and the weakness of mansabdari resulted in contract system (ijradari). Sahukars and contractors took land from jagirdars after payment on contract. On the one hand, these contractors tried to improve agriculture by introducing new methods. On the other hand, they ruthlessly exploited the peasants as it was their interest to earn more. As a consequence, peasantry suffered immensely.

Sometimes, regional rebellions are interpreted as outcome of the Mughal state's exploitation. But it is not true in all cases. For example, in case of the Marathas, the situation was different. From 15th to the 18th centuries, more land became cultivatable and new villages emerged on the landscape. Those families who had private landed properties amassed wealth and became ambitious to acquire political power. These were the families who revolted in 1670. Shivaji, first of all, subdued these powerful families and included them in his army as his allies. The leaders of his army belonged to these powerful families while soldiers were poor peasants.

The same was the case of the Sikhs who became prosperous as a result of advancement of agriculture and trade and commerce. As there were no restrictions of caste in the new religion, a large number of jats joined the Sikh movement and vehemently opposed the authority of the centre. Both the Maratha and Sikh movements were ethnic and regional.

The centre of the Mughal Empire was gradually becoming weak as the provincial states became autonomous. Once these provincial states were conquered by the East India Company, it became easy for the British to defeat the centre. Muzaffar Alam calls it not the decline or fall but decentralization of the Mughal Empire which ended the Mughal hegemony.

Fast Forward to the Past

No society is free from crime, though the frequency, the type and the intensity of the crime differs from society to society and from time to time. Any society, however, which divides itself on the basis of caste and class and draws distinctions among its members because of their social, economic and political status is more likely to breed crime and violence than society of another type.

But for all societies it is imperative to evolve a system of law in order to check and curb crime. It is, however, also historically proven that if a society fails to provide justice—letting the powerful to get away with any thing and making the poor suffer under the heavy burden of law—it becomes a society of apartheid, rendering itself unbalanced.

The caste-ridden society of ancient India, for example, tolerated the crimes committed by the Brahmans and the kashtriyas but the low caste offenders were severely punished in the name of justice and peace. Muslim society in the Indian subcontinent continued the same practice with some minor changes. The Muslim society in India was very conscious of the social status based on wealth, power, and lineage. This consciousness broadly divided the society between ashraf (the nobles) and ajlaf (the low caste people). At the top of the social hierarchy was the king who was above all law and as the 'shadow of God', was only responsible to Him. No earthly authority could challenge his actions or his judgments.

During the period of Muslim dynastic rule in India, crimes were of two types: one against the ruler and the other against the society. The king was not overly concerned about crimes such as theft, bribery, arson, poisoning, gambling, prostitution and murder. Sri Ram Sharma writes in his Mughal Government and Administration, "All other crimes were offences against individuals in which the society as represented

by the state was not much interested. Murder was an offence between the relatives of the murdered man and the murderer."

All political offences such as rebellion, treason and any opposition to the ruler were severely and speedily dealt with. Rebellion in particular was an unpardonable crime and rebels, taken as dangerous criminals, were immediately executed without any formal trial. There are a number of examples when the Muslim rulers punished their political opponents brutally. When Sultan Balban (1266-1286) quelled the rebellion of Tughral in Bengal, he hanged all the followers of the rebels and walked between the two rows of the hanged people along with his son and told him to get a lesson from this scene and never ever consider rebelling against the king of Delhi. Alauddin Khilji, (1296-1316), after crushing the rebellion of Muslim Mongols, executed them at once and distributed their women and children among the sweepers. Even I. H. Qureshi, who glorifies Muslim justice in India, admits in his administration of the Mughals, "ordinary crimes were, however, left within the jurisdiction of the Diwan al qada; only political crimes were looked upon as crimes against the state. As political considerations were dominant in the statement of the adjudication of such cases, it can be called siyasat."

As the rulers enjoyed absolute power, they gave their verdicts immediately, sometimes without hearing the aggrieved party. Most of the time, their judgments would be based on their personal whims. For example, such an enlightened ruler as Akbar once seeing a servant sleeping while on duty was so enraged that the poor man was executed instantly. Jahangir once ordered two peasants to be killed because they had accidentally disturbed his hunt. While punishing people like this, no legal procedure was followed and in spite of the presence of the qazis and muftis, the judgment of the king was neither challenged nor condemned.

After the ruler came the nobility, consisting of high ranking government officials, military officers, commanders and the members of royal family. They enjoyed unbound privilege and, thus, were beyond the orbit of law. Most of their crimes— such as bribery, corruption and harassment of peasants, artisans, and traders—went unnoticed. Because most of the common

people had no access to any authority in order to get their complaints registered, all the crimes committed by the nobility remained unpunished—except in one or two instances where a ruler would per chance hear a common man's complaint and reprimand or slightly punish the perpetrator. Such cases were, however, exceptions rather than being the rule. People endured all hardships silently, praying for divine punishment for the culprits.

There are a number of examples in the Mughal history when the members of nobility escaped justice and punishment, in spite of their open involvement in certain crimes. For example, Mirza Rustam Safavi, the governor of Thatta, oppressed the people to such an extent that the news reached even to Emperor Jahangir who only dismissed Mirza from his post and, after a lapse of time, reappointed him as governor of Bihar.

Not only the high officials but also their family members committed all types of crimes and knew that they would not be punished for them. During the reign of Jahangir, the son of governor of Lahore—known as Mirza Lahori — was in the habit of flogging his servants just to get sadistic pleasure. He even sometimes buried them alive, asking them to report their conversation with munkar and nakir (two angels who come in grave to investigate the faith of a dead person). He used to kidnap Hindu girls while they were being married and handed them back to their families after raping them. One of the favourite nobles of Jahangir, Muqarrub Khan, the governor of Khambayat, kidnapped a girl and kept her as his harem. Her mother, who was a widow, somehow succeeded in complaining to Jahangir but, despite royal efforts, the noble refused to hand back the girl. Instead, he paid some money to the mother and forced her to keep quiet.

Moreover, it was risky to complain because it meant inviting the wrath of the powerful. There are a number of examples where those who complained suffered as a result. During the reign of Shahjahan some people complained about the crimes committed by the governor of Orissa known as Baqar Khan. On hearing about the complaints against him, the governor killed seven hundred people only for complaining. Only one person escaped the massacre and reached the court in

Delhi but he was also killed by the son-in-law of Baqar Khan and all evidence of the crime was completely destroyed. The king, in spite of knowing about the crime, kept silent. One of the nobles of Aurangzeb, Nayabat Khan, killed one Abul Fazil Mamori but the only punishment meted out to the murderer was to deprive him of his post and title. And these, too, were soon restored.

Francisco Pelsaert, a Dutch traveler who visited India during Jahangir's period, writes about the system of justice during the Mughal period in his Jahangir's India in this way; "In every city there is a kachhari, or royal court of justice, where the Governor, the Diwan, the Bakhshi, the Kotwal, the kazi, and other officers sat together daily or four days in the week. Here all disputes are disposed of, but not until avarice has its share. All capital cases, such as thefts, murders—are finally disposed of by the Governor, if the criminals are poor and unable to pay, the sweepers drag them out to execution with very little ceremony." About the judges he observes: "Their eyes bleared with greed, their mouths gape like wolves for covetousness and their bellies hungry for the bread of the poor."

These recorded crimes of the Muslim nobility amply prove that the whole myth of Mughal justice was, in the first place, an invention of nationalist historians who glorified the Mughal rule in order to discredit the British administration. This approach is later adopted by Muslim communalist historians to prove that the rule of the Muslim dynasties was an enlightened one. I. H. Qureshi pays glowing tribute to Jahangir when he writes, "this Emperor took pride in the fact that the first order of his reign was to construct a 'chain of justice' which anyone seeking the protection of the monarch against the injustices of anyone of his officials could pull to raise an alarm in the palace."

There is, however, no evidence in contemporary sources that the chain was ever used. It remained a decoration piece signifying the mockery of justice.

In fact, only in the case of crimes committed against the state—such as rebellion, embezzlement, default on land revenue—no discrimination was made between a noble and a commoner and culprits were punished severely. For the rest of

.   the crimes, the privileged either remained unpunished or got away with minimum punishment.

The situation changed after the establishment of Anglo-Saxon system of judicial administration with the advent of British rule. To the Britishers, there was no difference between the nobles and the common people as far as the law was concerned. The Indian nobility was shocked when the members of the elite were called by the court and found themselves standing side by side with common people. In UP in particular the jagirdars asked the government not to treat them in courts in the same way as their tenants. This mentality of the nobility was reflected in the case of famous Urdu poet Ghalib. When he was arrested on the charge of gambling, everybody was shocked because nobody expected that the government would put such a prominent person in prison on a minor crime.

After independence, the judiciary in Pakistan for a short period retained the British tradition of treating all equally in terms of law but soon the whole tradition started to decline and our society reverted back to the medieval practices. Now the situation has come to such a pass that the privileged people are again getting away with everything like their Mughal era counterparts and the common people are enduring all legal hardships in the same way they did during the pre-British India.

Changing Trends of Muslim Community in India

There has been a tradition in history that nations distinguish themselves with others on the basis of social, cultural, or religious differentiations. For example, the Greeks regarded their neighbours as barbarians. The Arabs called the Iranians as *ajami* or deaf. The Jews consider them as the chosen people of God that is why there is no preaching and conversion in Judaism. The Christians and the Muslims call people of other religions as non-believers or pagans. Therefore, on the bases of these religious, cultural and civilizational prejudices, the relations of nations take shape—they are either friendly or hostile.

Suleiman Nadvi in his book *Hind-Arab Relations* divides the nations into four categories: the Muslims, people of the book, those nations who have similarities with the people of the book, and Non believers. On the basis of these categories, he describes the social relationship that is prescribed by religion. In their early conquests, the Muslims came into contacts with the Jews and Christians and as they were people of the book, there was no problem to conclude treaties with them. They were given the status of *dhimmis* and asked to pay *jizya* (poll tax). However, when they conquered Persia, they faced a problem: how to deal with the Zoroastrians who are not mentioned in the Holy Quran? The solution was found in declaring them similar to the people of the book and deserving to enjoy the same privileges i.e. pay *jizya* and have a status of *dhimmi*.

With the conquest of Sindh, the Muslims found people of quite different faith. They were Buddhists and Hindus. Again the question raised about how to deal with them? Muhammad Bin Qasim asked Hajjaj, his patron and the governor of Basra, to advise him. According to Chuchnama, Hajjaj wrote to him: "As they have made submission, and have agreed to pay taxes to the

Khalifa, nothing more can be properly required from them. They have taken our protection, and we cannot in any way stretch our hands upon their lives and property. Permission is given to them to worship their gods. Nobody must be forbidden in preventing from following their own religion. They may live in their houses in whatever manner they like."

The Turks and the Afghans who ruled North India followed the same model. The Hindus were treated as *dhimmis* and *jizya* was imposed in lieu of protection. The policy was criticized by the orthodox ulama from time to time but the rulers retained it. Though some of the Sultans, in order to please ulama, demolished temples and humiliated their Hindu subjects but generally, the policy of religious toleration was maintained.

When Akbar succeeded to the throne, he, adopted the policy of sulh-i-kul, that is to treat all his subjects equally irrespective of their religion. The model of sulh-i-kul is different from toleration. In toleration, the 'other' is regarded as unequal to the strong party. The sulh-i-kul, on the other hand, gave all of them equal status without any discrimination. Akbar believed that followers of all religions were on the right path, therefore, they had the right to worship according to their religious customs. This policy ended any differentiation between the believers and unbelievers. When Akbar married the Rajput princess in 1563, he did not ask his bride to change her religion. She was allowed to worship in the harem according to her faith without any disturbance. Akbar also abolished pilgrimage taxes on the Hindu pilgrims and finally abolished *jizya* in 1564.

Abul Fazl, the close friend and advisor of Akbar, supported him in formulating the policy of *sulh-i-kul*. He repeatedly emphasized that nobody should be allowed to oppose those ideas that were according to the need of time. He lamented that in the past the rulers handed over the authority of religion to those who were bereft of any understanding and their only hobby was to issue *fatawa* or religious injunctions. These people failed to comprehend the true spirit of religion. In 1593-94, Akbar issued radical laws to give his Hindu Subjects full religious freedom. Everybody was free to change his religion. Akbar also allowed the Hindus, Christians, Jews, and the Parsis to build their temples and churches.

The result of the policy of sulh-i-kul was that the Hindus became a part of the Mughal empire. They were trusted and appointed on high *mansabs* in the army, as well as in the administration. As a result of blending the two cultures, a new dynamic and energetic culture developed which made the Mughal rule unique in the Indian history. The model of sulh-i-kul continued successfully up to Aurangzeb. He made an attempt to reverse it and bring back the model of tolerance. That is why he imposed *jizya*, demolished some temples and also granted land to some to show his tolerance. Tolerance from the powerful is a blend of both coercion, as well as magnanimity.

Eighteenth and nineteenth centuries witnessed the decline and downfall of the Mughals and emergence of the Marathas, the Siksh, the Jats, and the Rohillas. This ended both the policies of toleration and sulh-i-kul. In the vacuum of political power, the ulama took the lead of the Muslim community and laid down the foundation of a third model, separatism. From Shah Waliullah to Haji Shariutullah, Saiyyid Ahmad Shaheed and Shah Ismail Shaeed all exhorted the Muslims of India to purify their faith from the Hindu customs and rituals. Ismail Shaheed in his book *Taqwiyatul Iman* gives details of the Hindus practices which were prevalent among the Muslims, such as to shave heads and put garlands on the festive occasions. All these religious movements wanted to revive Islam and deepen the religious identity. They feared that the Muslims might not be absorbed by the Hindus. Saiyyid Ahmad Shaheed made an attempt to establish an Islamic state in the NWFP. His effort failed because of his defeat at Balakot in 1831. However, the model of his Islamic state remains alive till now in the mind of the ulema.

·After 1857, there emerged two antithetical trends in the Muslim community: separatism and the collaboration with the British. The religious school of Deoband was in favour of separatism from the Hindus and the English, revival of purity of Islam, and to create a consciousness of religious identity. On the other hand Sir Saiyyid ˙ Ahmad Khan was in favour to compromise with the changing situation and adjust accordingly. He founded the Aligarh College to, educate and modernize the Muslim elite class. These two trends created two different

classes in the Muslim community. Deoband catered the lower-middle classes and undertook the task to protect Islam in the hostile Indian environments. The Aligrah educated elite classes made efforts to get government jobs and become part of the establishment.

However, in the struggle for Pakistan, when the European educated elite class became the leader of the Muslim community, the ulema resented it because they regarded themselves as rightful guides and protectors of the Muslims. That's why they opposed the idea of Pakistan. They feared that in a new country in the presence of secular and modern educated leaders they could not get any space for their authority.

Because of these reasons, they did not take part in the struggle for Pakistan. But once it came into existence some of the leading *ulema* came to the newly created country to snatch leadership from the politicians and fulfil their design to make it an Islamic state. Since then, the *ulema* are trying to establish the Shariat and rule the country. The rulers implemented the two models of toleration and *sulh-i-kul*. While the model of 'separation' was promoted by the *ulema*, the model of separation is now adopted not only by the *ulema* but also politicians. The legacy of separation is the major cause of not treating the religious minorities on the basis of equality. It is also a reason for not having good relations with India, as Hindus are regarded as our enemies.

Approaches to Colonial Rule

Those Asian and African countries that experienced colonialism and its effects, suffered immensely as their culture and history was distorted and reshaped by the colonial powers. After independence, the first important task of these countries was to rewrite their history and correct the distortions and omissions that were made by the colonialists to suit their political interests.

The first problem they faced was that of dealing with their colonial past, which reminded them of their defeat, humiliation, backwardness and disgrace. There were two approaches to handle this. The first was to learn a lesson from their colonization process and analyze the weaknesses of their society. They would discover the causes of their backwardness that led them to surrender, and take a lesson from history so that the same situation should not arise again.

The second approach was to ignore their colonial past altogether in order to forget their defeat and subjection by the colonial power. This approach was adopted by Spain when their historians completely ousted the Arab rule from their history, as if it had not taken, place, and continued their narratives without mentioning it. The same policy was adopted by the Balkan Christian states which erased the memories of the Ottoman rule from their history, so as not to have a sense of colonization.

Historians of the subcontinent are facing the same problem; how to analyze and deal with the British rule? It is not possible to erase it. It is a historical fact that cannot be ignored or deleted easily. The only question is: should it be treated as an intervention in the continuity of their history. Or, should it be analyzed as a period that kept historical continuity despite interference and instruction?

Another hypothetical question is that had there been no British rule, what would have been the shape of the subcontinent? No doubt, the British rule brought change, and

implanted new values institutions that broke relations with the past, and discontinued the historical process. Most importantly, it divided society into two distinct groups. The first was of those who were Westernized, and wanted to modernize India on the model of Europe. The second group clung to adhere to their cultural values, and opposed any change. The first had a contempt for their past, while the latter glorified it. This dichotomy is still going on both in India and Pakistan.

Those who are in favour of foreign rule, argue that if a developed power rules over an underdeveloped country, it expedites the process of modernization that otherwise takes a long time. On the basis of this argument, the pro-British group reasons that as a result of colonial rule, the Indians were introduced to modern thoughts. Its European educated class developed progressive ideas, and provided leadership to the emerging political parties. Research in orientalism brought to light the hidden and untraceable knowledge of the Indian past. European sciences and philosophy created a new consciousness and rationality among the educated class. Western material culture brought comfort and economic prosperity, and individuals made effort to enjoy the pleasures and the luxuries of life.

Political and social institutions provided an opportunity to the lower castes to get education and acquire dignity that was denied to them for centuries. The colonial society created new professionals such as advocates, journalists, judges and doctors that expanded the middle classes and their role in society.

These arguments are refuted on the ground that all these reforms were introduced by the colonial government for its own interests. However, it is proved by historical evidence that the government did not try to change the basic structure of society. It allowed the higher castes to keep their privileges in exchange of their collaboration.

G. Aloysius, in Nationalism without nation in India, points out that the British rule did not change the Indian society radically. The period is characterized by its continuity with the past rather than by a revolutionary break with, it. He also rejects the claim that the British unified India: "Effective structural unification under the British was a new phenomenon in Indian

history. The process was incomplete with nearly one third of the area of the subcontinent being retained by the Princely States, and uneven with the regions being brought under the central authority at different times and under different circumstances, terms and conditions."

Aloysius' argument is that, as a matter of fact, the British rule did not transform the Indian society, but retained its old values and traditions for its political stability. For example, when English became the official language, the upper castes, such as Brahman and Kayath, learnt it and maintained their old status intact. In trade and commerce, Marwaris and Banyas worked as agents to the East India Company, and profited immensely. In the rural areas, the feudal lords cooperated with them and enjoyed their patronization. As a result of it, these classes failed to play the role of agents of change, and society remained more or less the same.

The other approach to the study of the colonial period is that it integrated the European and the Indian civilizations that subsequently infused new blood to the stagnant culture of India. The new tools and methodology equipped the Indian intellectuals to probe and investigate the causes of their decline, and how to reform their society in order to respond to the new challenges. Raja Ram Mohan Roy's movement and Sir Syed's reforms movement led to values and traditions being judged on the basis of rationality rather than on dogma.

Therefore, neither we can say that the colonial period remained ineffective and old society remained intact, nor can we say that it brought revolutionary changed and transformed society completely. However, it is certain that the British rule brought changes in some aspects, but kept the old structure untouched, as it held no challenge to its rule. So, we find continuity as well as discontinuity in the process of Indian history as a result of its colonization. This requires studying the British period carefully with all its implications and complexities.

British Version of the Mughal Decline

Generally it is believed that the British came to power in India because of the decline of the Mughal empire; and at this juncture, the Indian society, loosening its cohesion and unity, became fragmented and divided. Its economy collapsed; its moral and ethical values and its traditions and institutions lost their credibility and authority. Consequently, this chaotic condition created a vacuum that was easily filled by the rule of the East India Company. Once in power, the Company inaugurated a new era that ended civil wars, crushed thugs and dacoits, and, by restoring peace and prosperity, established a government that laid down the foundation of political and economic stability. This interpretation of history was accepted for a long time without any challenge. However, in depth study of this period and new evidence proved it defective and one sided. It is now argued that the British historians and politicians present the whole theory of the Mughal decline with exaggeration in order to justify their rule.

There is no doubt that the Mughal empire was on decline after the death of Aurangzeb (1707). There were conspiracies and intrigues at the court that divided the nobility into different groups and weakened the structure of the state. It was the weakness of the state that encouraged Nadir Shah and Ahmad Shah Abdali to invade and plunder the accumulated treasury of the Mughals. In the end, as a result of political weakness, the emperor lost his prestige and depended either on the mercy of the Marathas or of the bounty of the Company. Not only did the emperor lose his glamour but the royal family and aristocracy were also reduced to abject poverty. Those who observed the decline of the court and nobility from the point of view of Delhi; they interpreted it as the decline of the Indian society. In reality, the situation was quite different. As Delhi was losing its past

glory, the provincial states emerged with new vigour and energy to play their role. Lucknow, Bengal, Hyderabad, Bikaner, Jaipur, and Poona state there are details about civil and rural life that clearly show that there was no disorder or dissatisfaction in the society. Interestingly, during the British rule, historians were not allowed to consult these documents because the government was afraid that the myth of decline would be challenged. In 1917, the governor of Bombay refused C.A, Kincaid to publish his book on Maratrha history fearing that it would contradict the official British point of view.

New research has also proved that the decline of Mughal state was not the decline of its institutions. The successor states continued the Mughal system in their territories such as Murshid Quli Khan and Ali Vardi Khan in Bengal. Even Ranjit Singh in the mid 19th century retained most of the Mughal institutions in his state.

Similarly, neither political decadence nor disintegration of authority exhausted the creative energy of the Indian society. Throughout the period, the society vehemently expressed its innovations in cultural and social activities. Herman Goetz in his book *The Crisis of Indian Civilization in the Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Centuries* writes: "For those symptoms of decadence which have been made a reproach to 18th century India, are clearly discernible in all those times which we consider as glorious periods in the history of other peoples. Can we overlook the fairy like palaces and gardens of Jaipur, Jodhpur, Dig, Udaipur, Lahore, Lukhnow, Murshidabad, and Poona? Can we deny the sweetness and the defined taste of the innumerable paintings of those times? Can we forget the Golden Age of Urdue, Bengali and Marathi literature? Can we doubt the high accomplishment of the music and dancing of those times? Or the refinement of social life and the important position of women in that society? Must we not come to the conclusion that the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries have been a period not only of political and economic decline, but also of the highest refinement of Indian culture?"

One of the positive effects of the decline of the Mughal court was that the high and refined culture which was the monopoly of king and nobility, was released from their clutches

· and spread all over India. Artists, poets, historians, and artisans wandered from one place to another for patronage. They experienced a new life outside the court that stimulated their creativeness. They found new venue to work and new topics to express their sentiments. Consequently, it enriched the Indian culture.

Neither did the society collapse because of economic standstill. Merchants and traders remained busy in their trade and supplied material to markets all over India. We find lots of details how new markets were established in towns and cities and increasingly became hubs of commercial activities. These are documented by C.A. Bayly in his book *Townsmen and Bazaars: North Indian Society in the Age of British Expansion 1770-1870.*

Another important characteristic of this time was the religious prejudices of people decreased. A popular religion was emerging with strong tendency to integrate different religious communities together. Shrines and sites for piligrimages were thronged by common people where they buried their religious differences and mingled with each others.

Therefore, it is evident that the whole theory of the Mughal decline and the coming of British as replacement was invented by British historians and popularized so extensively that it had become a hard fact of history. It takes time to deconstruct myths and bring to light real facts. The task has been done and now, it is proved that the Mughal decline did not affect the Indian society as whole. It remained alive, energetic and survived all political upheavals.

Foundation of the British Raj

It is intriguing but an import question in the history of India, how and why British acquired political power in India so smoothly and easily.

Was it decadence of Indian political, social and economic system that failed to respond effectively to check it? Or the changes that occurred in England and transformed its society that helped the British to assume superiority over the Indians? Or, accidentally they found themselves in such a situation that they grasped the opportunity to conquer and rule over India? Otherwise, it appears that they had no planning or scheme for conquest.

Further, it is also an important question whether they easily conquered India or they faced some resistance? There is no doubt that in their early stage there were no political ambitions of the Company and its servants. They were interested only in trade and how to get concessions from the rulers to earn more profit? The East India Company was not in a position to keep a large army. It kept only a small contingent for the protection of its business houses or factories. The number of soldiers, however, increased when as a result of collapse of the Mughal authority, military adventurers and bands of brigands started to loot and plunder. For example, Shivaji looted the city of Surat, which was a trading centre, many times.

The second reason for having a well-equipped army was the rivalry with the French. Up to the middle of eighteenth century, the British government and the Company bore all expenses of the army. But after that the authorities realized that the Company should bear the expenses which became unaffordable for them. The preceding events gave the Company enough local resources to recruit and maintain a large army on its own without asking any help from England.

The victory in the Battle of Plassy transformed the status of the Company from a trading house to a political power. In

this capacity, it started to make alliances and concluded treaties with the Indian states. It loaned them money on interest and provided them with armies for their protection. If these states could not pay in cash, the Company took their territory and collected revenue in exchange of its services. After the Battle of Buxer (1764), it got the right to collect revenue from Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. This helped it to sustain a large army.

Another method to defray the expenses was to ask the states to pay the cost of the troopers that were stationed in their territory for their defence. In 1770s, the Oudh states paid the expenses of two brigades that were posted there. As a result of military power, the Company ordered the native states to disband their armies and rely on their support. This reduced the power of the native rulers and they completely came under the control of the Company.

In it is the phenomenon of history that no imperialist power effectively controls any area or territory unless it gets local support and collaboration. In case of the Company, in its early stage, traders, merchants, businessmen, artisans, and agents, cooperated with it because they earned profit as a result of Company's commercial activities. History, records the names of those who earned a lot of profit and became *seths* in this process. In the Battle of Plassy, Jagat Seth and Umichand supported the British because of their business connections with them.

In the second stage when the Company became a political power in the North and Central India, it was joined by those Mughal bureaucrats who had vast experience of administration, but lost their jobs because of breakdown of the Mughal state. Maulana Fazl Haq Khairabadi and Sir Syed were among those prominent persons who loyally served the interests of the Company.

The Company also did not find any problem of recruiting soldiers for its army. There were peasants and villagers who were affected by civil wars when their agricultural land was devastated by the marching armies. Collection of taxes from different militant groups reduced them to poverty. When they got the chance to get employment in the Company's army, they readily availed it. Most probably, they were not aware that

they were helping a foreign power in conquering their own country. There were reasons for not realizing it. Firstly, British officers were few and they had to keep contact with their local officials and not with those who were on the top. Therefore, they were at ease to accept their commands and serve them loyally. Perhaps, the other reason for supporting a foreign power was that it happened before in the history of India. The only difference this time was that like Mahmud of Ghazna or Babur, who brought their own armies from their countries, the British came a few in number and recruited army based purely on the Indian manpower. However, they brought new techniques of warfare which was quite unknown to the Indians. The locals were also supporting the Company in the hope that it would end civil wars among the small states, unify India on the model of the Mughal state and maintain peace and security in the country.

The experience of the Indians regarding invaders was that after conquering India, they cut off their contacts with their motherland and settled in India permanently. Such happened in case of the Arabs and the Turks. However, the case of the British proved quite different. They were not like previous military adventurers, rather servants of a business house that was controlled by the Board of Directors and Board of Control. They had to follow their instructions. And they had to go back after completing their tenure of service in India. However, it is wrong to say that the British conquered India without any resistance. On the contrary, they had to fight for occupation of every territory. The resistance was offered individually as well as collectively. There were two types of the states which emerged after the fall of the Mughals: those which recognized the British supremacy after offering little resistance such as Oudh and Hyderabad. The second category were those states that resisted the foreign power and surrendered after bloody battles such as Marathas, Sikhs and Mysore.

The study of British Raj and its analysis provides us an insight of history that how foreign powers with collaboration, intervened and dominated a country. It was true in the past and is also valid today.

Re-assessing British Rule in South Asia

In historiography, past is assessed and reassessed from time to time. This is done with the help of newly discovered manuscripts, state or private papers, letters and contemporary memoirs or on the basis of new methods and ideas that provide space or new interpretation. That is how history gets new blood and remains interesting.

The same has been applied to the British rule in India, that was analyzed before the Independence, by historians and politicians who experienced it, directly and expressed their views about it.

In the first instance, their focus was on the economic exploitation of India, as pointed out by Dadabhai Noroji (1901). This point was further explained by R.C. Dutt, that as a result of plunder, India was deprived of its resources and became an economically backward country.

In the second phase, research was focused on the demand of political rights and share in the administration, from the colonial government by the emerging middle class that was well equipped by the modern education. The new political situation paved the way for organization of political parties. Thus, economic and political consciousness played an important role to make the Indians active to struggle against the foreign rule. However, the political consciousness, that on one side, attempted to unite all communities under the banner of nationalism, also on the other hand, it divided the Hindus and the Muslims on the question of nationalism.

The Indian nationalists traced their roots to the ancient past which antagonized the Muslims, who found no place and attraction in the Vedic period or in the slogan of 'Ram Raj'. The Muslims, therefore rejected it and turned towards the classical Islamic past, in search of their roots and asserted their own

concept of nationalism, based not on geographical territories or sharing the historical past, but on religion and history of Islam. As a result of conflict between two concepts of nationalism, the Indian Muslims concentrated their energies to fight against the domination of the Hindus, rather than to struggle against the British.

Louis D. Hayes in *The Struggle for Legitimacy in Pakistan* (1986) writes: "The demand for Pakistan was not based upon grievances of the past, but upon those of future. It ultimately led them for *Two Nation Theory* and a separate homeland."

After partition and having a separate and independent country, when we analyze our 'freedom struggle', we find disillusionment and disappointment among people, because their expectations were not fulfilled. This is evident in the titles of those books which are written on partitions by historians, politicians, activists, and bureaucrats, such as *Shattered Dreams*, *Betrayal, Disillusionment*, or *Failed State*.

At this juncture, when half a century has passed after Independence and the country and its leaders have achieved nothing to satisfy people, those who experienced the British rule become nostalgic and remember those old days when there was law and order, justice and efficiency of the bureaucracy. There was peace and prosperity for common people who had a sense of security. Memories of the old days and the blessings of the British rule completely ignore their economic exploitation and political domination. People do not find any change in their lives, in spite of transformation of their status from 'subject' to 'citizen'. They cannot exercise their fundamental rights in spite of constitutional guarantees.

The change in historical perception occurs because our successive governments and leaders have failed to deliver. They are responsible to make society backward and poor. As our backwardness accelerates, we remember the time of the British government, when common people faced no such problems as they are facing today. As our bureaucrats and officials become corrupt and inefficient, we remember more and more the English *sahibs* who worked honestly and efficiently for the welfare of common people. Therefore, as our present becomes bleak and

dark, we look to the colonial period for solace and comfort and remember the golden days of foreign rule, which was benevolent and enlightened. This is how we look to the past with the eyes of present.

Keeping in view this perspective of history, there arises a question that if the majority of our society is unanimous, that the British rule was just and honest then why they struggled against it. The end results proved that our independence is a 'myth' and our victory is nothing but an illusion. In this case, we have to re-judge all those heroes and freedom fighters who fought against a 'just' government, for the establishment of worst and corrupt system. These analyses must change the status of our national heroes and transform them as enemies of people who led them to disaster. With this perspective, all our sacrifices for liberty and independence become worthless. The question is that, if we accept this version of history, then, there is no need to celebrate the 'Day of Independence' and award our 'freedom fighters' for their sacrifices. It also becomes unnecessary to call this period as 'Movement for Freedom.'

Citizen Tipu

During the British Rule, the opinion about Tipu remained biased. Only during the nationalist struggle was he discovered as a hero who fought against the foreign rule

It is a phenomenon of history that a super and expansionist power does not tolerate any defiance or resistance from small and weak states. Emboldened by power and arrogance, it demands surrender and acceptance of its terms. Any refusal and violation is regarded open rebellion.

It happened in case of the East India Company that arrived in India as a trading company but gradually transformed itself as a political power. The European advancement in technology, management, and administration made them a superior power in India. Realizing the weakness of the native Indian states, the Company embarked on the path of imperialism and devoured one by one all major states. Some of them meekly surrendered and accepted their humiliating terms; others were occupied and absorbed in the British territory.

In the process, one power which not only defied but challenged the British, was Haider Ali and his son Tipu. Their crime was not only resistance to the emerging power of the British but to modernize Mysore state on the model of Europe. That is why Tipu became a bitter enemy and an obstacle for further expansion and fulfillment of the East India Company's political ambitions in India.

Propaganda is an effective instrument to malign enemies and to get a justification to destroy them. Tipu was portrayed as usurper, tyrant, cruel, arrogant and bigoted Muslim by the British administration. Especially, to create religious hatred, and division between the Hindus and Muslims, Francis Buchanon declared that he "wantonly destroyed their (Hindus) temples". Wilks, a British historian, lamented that he "oppressed and insulted his Hindu subjects". Having successfully poisoned the mind of the Indian and English public at home, the stage was set

to take action against him and forced him either to accept their terms or be ready for elimination.

Tipu had tenacity to survive against the 'coalition' forces of the British, the Nizam, and the Marhattas. In 1792, after his defeat he lost half of his territory, gave two of his sons as hostages and promised to pay 3.30 crores as war indemnity. In spite of huge losses he survived and not only paid the amount but continued his modernisation process in his state. Having failed to crush his spirit, the coalition again attacked him without any provocation and finally in 1799, he was defeated and laid down his life fighting valiantly. It was May 4, the hottest day of the month.

The author of the History of Hyder Ali & Tipu Sultan writes: "the commanding officer (General Baird) came in the evening to the gateway, attended by the Keladar and several of the sultan's servants, to search for the body. After much labour it was found, and brought from among a heap of slain. His eyes were open, and the body was so warm, that for a few moments Colonel Wellesley and others were doubtful whether he was not alive: on feeling his pulse and heart, that doubt was removed. He had four wounds, three in the body, and one in the temple, the ball having entered a little above the right ear, and lodged in the cheek. The countenance was no way distorted, but had an expression of stern composure."

On the funeral procession of Tipu the same writer mentions that: "The street through which the procession passed were lined with inhabitants, many of whom prostrated themselves before the body, and expressed their grief in loud lamentations."

Though Tipu was buried with honour, his enemies were afraid that even the dead sultan could become a danger for them as he was loved and respected by his subjects. Attempts were therefore made to eradicate all traces of him from Mysore. His whole family was transferred to Calcutta, his treasury plundered, his furniture, books, dresses, and all personal belonging were confiscated and, distributed. The old Hindu ruling dynasty was restored. What remained were his tomb and buildings which even today remind of him and his rule to the people of the Indian subcontinent.

Once facts are distorted and a person is condemned as villain and demon by his adversaries on the basis of manipulated propaganda, it becomes very difficult to correct those lies and bring to light the hidden truth. During the British rule, the opinion about Tipu remained biased. Only during the nationalist struggle, he was discovered as a hero who fought against the foreign rule.

Unfortunately, in the rise of the Hindu fundamentalism, Tipu again becomes the victim of fanaticism and is portrayed as an anti-Hindu who forcibly converted the Hindus to Islam. However, in 1916, the discovery of Tipu's letters to the Swami Sringeri and evidence of his grants to the Hindu temples prove that he was tolerant to his subjects irrespective of their religion. Not only to the Hindus, he also took care of the faith of his Christian prisoners and in 1798, asked the viceroy of Goa to send priests to perform religious duties for them. He was himself an orthodox Muslim but kept religion and politics separate. His most confidential officers were Hindus on whom he relied.

Realising that the East India Company was a threat to Mysore state, he undertook projects to modernise it in order to face the forthcoming challenges. Haider Ali reformed the army in his lifetime, Tipu further improved it. There were better weapons that were manufactured in his factories. Especially, he concentrated to build a strong navy not only for war but also to protect his overseas trade. To improve the material condition of his subjects and to increase financial resources of the state, he improved agriculture by building canals, embankments, and dams. Facilities were provided to peasants. Revenue officials were checked not to harass the peasantry while collecting taxes.

He fully understood that the European success owed much to trade; therefore, he established different industrial factories such as paper, cutlery, and arms and weapons for domestic consumption as well as for import. He was interested in promoting overseas trade and therefore, established a factory at Musqat. He sent ambassadors to the Ottoman Sultan and the French monarch not only to establish diplomatic but trade relations with them. He also made attempts to reform communities by banning wine, prostitution, slavery, human sacrifice, and polyandry.

Tipu was enthusiastic to learn European technology and instructed his ambassador to France to request the king to send a printer, clock maker, and artisans for making chinaware, glass and mirror. He wanted to send one of his sons to France for education. After the end of French monarchy, he maintained friendly relations with the Revolutionary government and in 1797, a Jacobin club was founded at Sarangapatam and the republican flag was hoisted in presence of 'Citizen' Tipu. A Tree of Liberty was planted on this occasion.

Tipu had a broad vision to modernise not only his state but also his people. In this process he faced challenges from those who were losing their privileges and social status. He tried to abolish feudalism that created anger and discontent among this class. They had hidden contempt for Tipu and his family as he belonged to a lower class. The Nizam of Hyderbad snubbed him on the proposal of matrimonial alliance to his family. This hatred led them to conspire against him and leading members of the noble families collaborated with the English to overthrow him.

The greatness of Tipu is that he refused to surrender and preferred a death of honour. The lesson of history is that if some individuals are ready to sacrifice society's interests to their own and collaborate with invaders, the task of aggressor becomes easy. They find it easy to crush those who defy their demands and resist against their invasion and intervention. What happened in the past can happen today.

1857: How is it Interpreted?

It is known as the rebellion, the sepoy mutiny, Uprising, Revolt, and War of Independence. As the British ruled at the close of the war, the British interpretation dominated historiography and it was referred to as a 'Mutiny' or 'Ghadar' in all official documents and papers. The use of 'War of Independence' in the Indian historiography asserts that the British were usurpers and the war was an attempt to expel them from India. In the end it has become a debate in history for both sides to justify their claims.

In May 10, 1857, the sepoys of Meerut camp revolted against their British officers and on May 11, marched to Delhi where they proclaimed Bahadur Shah Zafar as the emperor. The outbreak of rebellion came as a shock to the British who were not prepared to face it. However, their discipline organisation, management, technology and the collaboration of the Indians helped them to crush it.

The end of rebellion brought significant changes: the Mughal rule finally came to an end and Bahadur Shah was tried on the charges of treason and exiled; the rule of the East India Company terminated and India came under the direct rule of the Queen. When the danger was over, then came the analysis as to why it happened?

Though the Indians suffered as a result of the war, such was the fear of the government that no one had the courage to express his views openly. The result was that the feeling of the people regarding 1857 remained untold. Only in the later period and during the national struggle, these memories surfaced and the Indian point of view emerged.

However, the British and European historians still call it mutiny in spite of its legal implications: the Mughal king was the legitimate ruler the East India Company was his servant, therefore, how a king could be tried on charges of treason by an institution which had no legality. However, legality absurd when it confronts military power. It happened in the case of the East

India Company; having military power it took decisions that suited its interests. The use of 'War of Independence' in the Indian historiography asserts that the British were usurpers and the war was an attempt to expel them from India. In the end it has become a debate in history for both sides to justify their claims.

What happened in 1857 surprised the British government so much that official circles disputed as to whether it was a sepoy mutiny or a civil rebellion against the Raj. There were different interpretations of the events. Their main concern was not to admit that it was an outbreak of the people against the unjust policies of the government, therefore, they tried to minimize its effects. The official view after the outbreak of the sepoy rebellion was that Bengal native army was responsible for the mutiny and the civil disturbances that followed were the result of the breakdown of law and order.

Israeli, the British Prime Minister, however, called it a national revolt. The British civil and military administrations in India kept shifting the blame onto one another. William Muir, a distinguished civil administrator, put the blame on the army and referred to the event as a 'military mutiny': a struggle between the government and the soldiers and not between the government and the people.

The European Mercantile community, on the other hand, blamed Canning the Governor General for his soft policy towards the natives. This process of mutual accusation continued for sometime until the rebellion was completely quelled. Historians, both British and Indian, analysed the event with different perspectives. The British historians analysed the event from a purely administrative point of view and tried to understand the phenomenon so as to check such occurrences in future.

J.W Kay's book *History the Sepoy War* (London 1867) was the first study on the real cause of the outbreak. Kaye points out that the British policy of depriving the aristocracy, religious circles and the peasant proprietary class of the privileges was the cause of the unrest. G.B. Malleson in his book *The Indian Mutiny of 1857* {London 1891) emotionally deals with the event and condemns Canning for his mild policy. He eulogizes those

British generals and soldiers who fought and restored British power. Malleson and other historians who have thus analysed it, seemed to have been enamoured of a conspiracy theory; the mutiny according to them was the product of the conspiracy of Maulana of Faizabad, Nana Sahib, and Rani of Jhansi who mutually hatched the conspiracy with the sepoys.

T. Rice Holmes in the *History of the Indian Mutiny* (1883) expresses the view that, the resulting civil rebellions were the product of the mutiny. Once the sepoys revolted, the law and order situation deteriorated. The *taluqdars* and the dispossessed landholders took advantage and started to loot and plunder government property.

Syed Ahmad Khan was the first Indian who in his pamphlet *The Causes of the Indian Mutiny* identifies racial arrogance, missionary activities to convert people, and violation of religious sensibilities of the Indians as causes that created discontent and led to mutiny. His pamphlet was translated into English and presented in the British parliament. It helped those who were against the Company and wanted to end its rule.

On the other hand, Indians who wrote on the event have confined their accounts to tragedies of the mutiny without referring to the British crimes. Zahir Ahmad Dehlawi in his *Dastan-e-Ghadar* beautifully depicts the social life of Delhi before 1857 and collapse of the society after the event but avoid writing anything that may offend the British government.

Contemporary British writers, on the contrary, highlight the sufferings of the British and how they were treated by the Indians. The Kanpur massacre, the killing of the women and children at Delhi and others are condemned as crimes against humanity, but what was done by the British army to the Indian people is justified and not a word of sorrow is expressed on the massacre, plunder, torture and humiliation of the Indian.

Another interpretation of 1857 presented by the British administrative historians is that the masses were happy under British rule and it was the Muslim elite that mobilized the masses to fight against the British. Alfred Loyall and William Muir are the exponents of this interpretation. Loyall writes: "the whole insurrection is the great Mohammedan conspiracy (1857) and the sepoys were merely tools in the hands of the Mussulman.

J.G, Browne in his book *The Punjab and Delhi in 1857* (1861) gives further strength to this interpretation and tries to prove that the Muslims were the instigators and Hindus their dupes.

During the Freedom Movement when Indian nationalism was at its height, V.D. Savurkar wrote his monumental book *The First Indian War of Independence of 1857* (London 1909). He was the first man who called it the 'War of Independence' and paid glowing tribute to all Indians who fought against the British. Nationalism makes no distinction of race and religion with him and the Hindus and Muslims both appear as an untied force against the foreign rule.

After independence (1947), the events of 1857 have been interpreted from different points of view. Historians have dispassionately judged it. The most objective study was done by S.N. Sen in his book simply titled 1857. It was published by the Indians government in 1957 to commemorate the centenary of the event. Sen's interpretation is that there was no prior conspiracy and what happened in 1857 was a national uprising. This interpretation was challenged by R.C. Majundar in his book *The Sepoy Mutiny and revolt of 1857* (1957). He has tried to prove that in 1857 there was no national revolt; it was merely a sepoy mutiny. The civil rebellion in 1857 were the by-product of the mutiny. S.B. Chaudhuri, opposing this view proves in his book *Civil Rebellions in the Indian Mutinies* (1957) that it was a national revolt against the British.

In Pakistan, I.H. Qureshi and Moin ul Haq, following the point of view of Alfred Loyall and William Muir that the Muslims were mainly involved in the uprising give the entire credit to the Muslims who were mainly involved in the uprising. They ignore the role of the Hindus. This point of view is further narrowed down by religious scholars such as Maulana Muahmmad Mian, who, in his book *The Glorious Past of the Indian Ulema*, highlights the role of the ulema, giving them the entire credit for mutiny. It is the Maulan's interpretation alone that has found its way into our textbooks as the only authentic interpretation.

The Process of Change

A change that emerges from within a society and gradually transforms it tends to create no uproar as opposed to a change that comes spontaneously and shakes the whole society

Change is a painful process, especially for societies that remain stagnant and entrenched in their old and outdated traditions and customs. Traditions become sacred and sacrosanct as a result of their long life and utility to certain groups and sections of society. Any attempt to bring them in line with the contemporary world is met with stiff resistance.

A change that emerges from within a society and gradually transforms it creates no uproar as opposed to a change that comes spontaneously and shakes the whole society. And if the change comes from the outside, it creates suspicion and doubt and is regarded as subversion to weaken a society. Are not we familiar with the rhetoric about foreign cultural invasion, conspiracy against our traditions, and the acts of the invisible foreign hand?

Change does not come alone; it brings in its fold new elements of knowledge. Therefore, without having full understanding of knowledge, change becomes an enigma which cannot be comprehended by the majority of a society. There was a time when the process of change was very slow, but now as a result of scientific progress, the pace of change has become accelerated. Therefore, societies that are ready to accept it have an edge over those that resist it. History shows that the phenomenon of change keeps a society vibrant and dynamic. Without change, society becomes dull and sleepy.

With this background in mind, when we study the reaction of the Indian ulema to the technological inventions which were introduced during the colonial period and which brought structural changes to the Indian society, we understand how and why the process of change disturbed the ulema, specially of the traditional kind. Having no knowledge and

resources to fight against those changes and to understand their implications, they simply took refuge in religion in an effort to resist everything on the basis of religious injunctions.

The reason why they failed to understand the importance of those technological changes and their impact on social and cultural life of society, is that these inventions were produced by a society which was scientifically more progressive. It believed in moving with the times and when changes were incorporated there were no shocks to the system.

In the case of pre-Partition India, the same technological inventions became sudden in nature, and, as a result of backwardness, the society failed to understand the evolutionary process of its development and regarded them more as some sort of rather than science. Their social impact was also regarded as interference in their age-old practices and traditional lifestyle.

The founder of the Deoband seminary, Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi, had strictly forbidden keeping philosophy in the syllabus and had warned that if any of his students was found inclined towards philosophy, he would be expelled without delay.

In the famous Nizamiyya syllabus, which was prepared in the 18th century to train students for the posts of *qazi, mufti*, and *muhtasib*, neither history of Islam nor that of India, nor geography nor any subject in science could find a place. The same principle was followed later by the Deoband madrasah, which was established ten years after the 1857 struggle and was aimed at uniting the Muslim community in religious terms.

Mushirul Haq, in his book *Muslim Politics in Modern India*, analysed the syllabus of the Deoband seminary, writing that there was no provision in the syllabus about the study of Islamic history. Besides, no importance was given to the English language, which by that time had become the second language of India. The same was the case with other such institutions, like Firingi Mahal and Mazahir al Ulum.

As their knowledge system was based on the mediaeval pattern, it kept the students unaware of the modern social, political, economic, and scientific changes. As they were not well equipped to work as artisans or professionals, the only choice for them was to get employment either in a mosque or

madrasah. Resultantly, their interest was to get more mosques built, more madaris established and more funds collected from the Muslim community in the name of religion.

The situation made them the defenders of Islam and the opponents of anything which challenged the existing practices. Their opposition to new ideas and innovations can be judged by the collection of *fatawa*. Here we refer to the *Fatawa-i-Darul ulum* and *Fatawa-i-Rashidiyya* where there are a number of religious injunctions against new social and technological changes. For example, the former declared that to wear solar hat was against religion as it was an imitation of Christians, it was advised that Muslims should not follow what the non-Muslims practiced.

On inquiries about photography, it was declared that only four types of pictures were allowed: headless pictures of human beings or animals; or a picture put in a humiliating way in some part of house; or so small that if it was on ground nobody could recognize it; and, finally, unfinished dolls for girls. To one of the inquiries whether it was religiously legal to make a map to show animals, birds, mountains, and rivers for information, the response was that to draw a picture was totally forbidden in Islam, but if there was a need to do that, it should be without heads and facial distinction.

Somebody asked the question about religious legality of showing picture of the Islamic rulers in cinema. He was told that to show the picture of the rulers of Islam in cinema, as a tool for amusement and fun, was an insult to the Islamic kings, therefore it should be prohibited. It was further declared that cinema was totally sinful.

After the introduction of radio when a question was asked whether to listen to it or not, the *fatwa* announced that as radio was used for relaying songs, it should not be allowed to broadcast recitation of the Holy Quran. Even to hear recitation of the Holy Quran from gramophone was declared illegal.

In the *Fatawa-i-Rashidiyya*, one can also find strong reaction against all social, political, and economic changes. In one of the decrees, it was declared that to send money by money order was against religious law. To keep money in banks either

on interest or without interest was also declared against the Islamic norms.

Apart from these few examples, the ulema opposed all that challenged the traditions, religious otherwise. The hostility of ulema to everything new indicates a gap of knowledge between them and the evolution and development of technological inventions. However, in spite of the opposition of the ulema, the people and society accepted them because they provided comfort and proved useful in their daily lives. Even the class of ulema which opposed these in the beginning, adopted them later on, realizing their utility and general acceptance.

However, the ulema did not learn any lesson from history and go on with the same attitude to oppose it in the first state and adopt it later on when the inventions become acceptable to society. It is evident that such an approach is a great hindrance to the development of Muslim society.

In the name of war

When George W. Bush launched his war against terrorism, giving the message to nations that 'either you are with us or against us', he divided it into two distinct categories: friends and enemies. This language of war and categorization into 'us' and 'them' is not new. It echoes what the Roman emperor Caesar wrote in his book 'Bello Gallico'. He regarded any war between the Roman and other nations as a conflict between good and evil. The sense of justice gave the Roman soldiers moral boost to fight and wipe out evil. The Muslims fighting against the hostile powers also followed this binary division. They called themselves 'holy warriors' while the others were depicted as 'polytheist', and 'deceitful'. This division of right and wrong, of evil and justice provided a moral justification to fight and lay down their lives for a cause that was greater and higher than their lives.

In the medieval times, religion played an important role in fighting a war. Whether the war was between the Christians and the Muslim or an internecine war between two religious sects and groups. In all such cases, each believed that his religion or sect was right and God was on his side. During the European colonization, the mission of civilization happened in the name of religion. The non-European powers were barbarians and needed to be civilized. When the European states became secular, the cause for war also became non-religious. For example, in WWI and WWII the slogans were democracy, liberalism, and human values against expansionism, Fascism and Nazisim. However, in all cases, whenever there was war, emotions for patriotism were exploited to unite people for support to their respective governments.

It is a fact that throughout history ruling classes glorified war and warriors. Those who fought were given high status and in case of their death, they were called martyrs. If they survived, they were idolized as heroes. On the contrary, those who

opposed war and preached for peace were ridiculed and satirized as coward. Sometimes they were called traitors and agents to foreign powers. In history books we also find conquerors and victors as great men while those writers, thinkers and philosophers who preached for peace are marginalized.

The building of monuments further glorifies war. The characteristics of these monuments were different from country to country. These monuments were built in graveyards, squares of cities, and as a part of important state buildings. The purpose was to remind people of the greatness of their nation and how bravely the soldiers fought and heroically died on fronts. In this way, they became a link between people and war. Besides monuments, the states have also established war museums in which war weapons are displayed to show to the people the power and strength of their state. The result is that these edifices and memorials perpetuate war in the minds of people.

However, with the passage of time the concept of war has changed. With the emergence of new technologies, soldiers as well as citizens both are involved in war and suffer equally. We have witnessed as how in the World Wars cities were destroyed and millions lost their lives.

Moreover, the whole concept of war has also changed from the medieval to the modern period. There was a time when enemies used to fight face-to-face and admired each other's valour and bravery. All these medieval values of the East and West have changed with the advent of new technology and new weapons. There is no need to fight your adversary face to face. Now, there are planes that bomb cities and pilots do their jobs without seeing the enemy. Likewise missiles fired from a distance destroy enemy targets. The job is done without any feelings.

Recently, a new language has evolved.. It is said that the plane hit targets. The target is an abstract item that evokes no emotions. When recently American war planes mistakenly bombed a caravan in Afghan war, the Pentagon spokesman said that it was a 'good target'. No mention of the number of people who died as a result of this. Sometimes it is said that they regret loss of life. That's all.

Similarly, a new phrase, 'collateral damage' has been coined describing the killing of civilians and destruction of their properties. Again it evokes no emotions and sorrow. War not only destroys cities and kills people but also culturally changes societies. Human values that are nurtured by poetry, fiction, art and music, decay during war and in its place artists, poets, and musicians justify war through their work and mobilize people's emotions. Hate, prejudice, and hostility are created against enemy. Not only this, but fundamental rights and civil liberties that have been achieved as a result of long and strenuous struggle are suppressed in the name of national interest. Culturally a society is robbed of moral and ethical values. This is the tragic result of war.

When war comes to an end, people enquire about the results. This was beautifully portrayed after the First World War, when a French filmmaker, Abel Gance, screened a film J'accuse, in which a wounded soldier comes to his village and narrates his dream to his fellows that he saw dead soldiers come out from their graves wrapped in tattered bandage with upraised arms. They left their graves and walked down in the lane of their village to see if their sacrifices had been in vain or not. What they found: the pettiness of civilian life, infidelity of their wives, and selfishness of their friends, they were shocked and found their sacrifices useless. The villagers were so horrified by seeing dead among them that they mended their way. Seeing this, the dead returned to their graves with satisfaction that their mission had been fulfilled. After telling this dream, the wounded soldier accessed the son standing idly be watching the war go on. Giving this message he died. The film stunned people and the question that was asked was why people should sacrifice their lives in war when they fail to change the world. It remained the same in spite of their sacrifices.

Agonies of War

Throughout history, war has brought suffering and devastation to mankind. But First World War brought more disaster than before, because it was the war in which more lethal weapons were used and more brutal methods were adopted by rival countries to make each other defenceless.

Dead soldiers in trenches, scenes of dangling bodies on barbed wires and disfigured faces of the wounded—all these images brought horrific memories of war. Moreover, the cost in human and material terms was staggering. The total number of casualties were 22 million dead and 21 million wounded. Young and able-bodied men, the pride and source of inspiration, were killed in war and became the 'lost generation'.

It shattered the European dream of progress and prosperity for the coming generations and provoked intellectuals, thinkers and artists to question the very concept of war. They exposed the lies of the official propaganda and the ulterior motives of the ruling classes and states that exploited the emotions of patriotism and nationalism to achieve them. They also questioned the claim of countries fighting for a right cause. The question was "What about those soldiers and their sacrifices who died for a wrong cause?" These and other such question were discussed and debated throughout Europe. There was such bitterness and anger among the intellectuals that they thought it was their moral duty to launch a campaign to subvert the official and traditional concept of war and counter state propaganda by popularizing anti-war movements.

Earnest Frederick, a German anti-war activist, established a war museum in 1924, in Germany, to counter the state-founded war museums that glorified war. His museum, on the contrary, showed the horrors of war by displaying pictures of war fronts. These images horrified people who were away from the scenes of war and not fully aware of its realities. On the other hand, when the statues of the war heroes were erected in

public places to show their heroism and glorious death, one German artist, Kaethe Kollwitz, whose son died in war, decided to carve a statue of her son. In the statue, the parents lean against the dead body of their son with gloomy faces that indicated their deep sorrow and pain.

Jay Winter, in his book *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mouring*, writes about Kaethe's memorial statue: "Why she and her husband are on their knees before their son's grave. They are there to beg his forgiveness, to ask him to accept their failure to find a better way, their failure to prevent the madness of war from cutting his life short."

Such was the impact of war and the loss that since then she has painted anti-war paintings.

In the aftermath of the war, memoirs, novels, dramas, short stories and poetry revealed a wealth of ideas about war that were contrary to the traditional and official views in which war was romanticized arid idealized. Jay Winter collected the excerpts from the memoirs of soldiers who experienced the war and narrated their experience with intense feelings. Henri Barbusse, a French soldier who fought against the German, writes about his days in the trenches: "What a life. Mud, earth, rain. We are saturated, dyed, kneaded. One finds dirt everywhere, in pockets, in handkerchiefs, in clothes, in food. It is a haunting memory, a nightmare of earth and mud, and you have no idea of what a weird-looking fellow I am."

An Austrian, Karl Kraus, wrote a book *The Last Days of Mankind*. The book condemns war and accuses the ruling classes of misleading their people and forcing them to die for nothing. Addressing the dead soldiers, he questions them: "You who were sacrificed did not rise up against this scheme? You did not repent...you did not spit this glory to their faces? You did not break out, did not desert for a holy war, to liberate us at home from the archenemy who daily bombarded our brains with lies?" He then implored the dead: "So, rise up and confront them as the personification of a hero's death, so that the cowardice of the living, empowered to command, might finally come to know death's features and look death in the eye for the rest of their lives. Wake their sleep with your death cry. Come back and ask them what they have done with you! What they did

as you suffered through them, before you died through them...demand your precious head back from them...it is not your dying, but you have lived through that I want to avenge."

G.B. Shaw, the British playwright, vehemently opposed war and scathingly writes in *Heartbreak House*: "When men were practically dying for their country, it is not the time to show their lovers and wives and fathers and mothers how they are being sacrificed to the plunders of boobies, the cupidity of capitalists, the ambitions of conquerors, the electioneering of demagogues, the Pharisaism of patriot, the lust and lies and rancours that loved war because it opens their prison doors and sets them in the thrones of power and popularity."

World War II did not create such a strong reaction, as did WW I. The probable explanation is that the propaganda to fight against Fascism and Nazism provided the justification of war, specially as the intellectuals of Germany and Italy suffered by their own governments. They regarded the war against their own countries a tool to liberate their people from the dictatorial regimes. The aggression and occupation of neighbouring countries by Germany and Japan and their brutalities subdued the impact of allied bombardments and the use of nuclear weapons against Japan after their defeat.

War Heroes and Mourning Hypocrisy

In subcontinent, the culture of mourning over the war victims has taken a different dimension, becoming more artificial than before

Mutilated bodies, limbs scattered here and there and ground red with human blood: This is what every war has always left behind it. And what should be done with remains of these 'war heroes' has always been a controversial issue. Should they be buried in the ground where they fought on or be shifted to their ancestral graveyards? There has always been a divided opinion about it.

In the early history, the soldiers were buried at the place of their killing and these graveyards were converted into war memorials. The practice continued in the modern times. However, the World War-I invigorated the old debate when some families demanded that their dead sons should be buried in their ancestral graveyards.

The father of a dead soldier wrote to the authorities in July 1919: "Though they are dead, we want to remove them from these accursed battlefields. They did their duty. Now we must do ours for them; to let them rest in peace in the cemetery of their ancestors. To abandon them is to condemn them to eternal torment. The war today is over. The livings are going home. Let's return the dead to their villages, to those villages which were in their last thought at the tragic moment of their deaths."

On the other hand, there were a number of people who want these 'war heroes' remain buried at the place where they sacrificed their lives in the line of their duty. A father whose son was killed in a war expressed his wish in these words: "I think my son must rest among those with whom he fought; he led his men in battle and I want him to remain among his comrades

(after his death); that the battle will continue for him, that he be on the frontier and inspire the future generations to defend his country in case of a new attack.

In Europe, during the First World War, a system was evolved to communicate the news of death of soldiers to their families, In France, it was duty of the town mayor to inform the family about the death of their soldier relative. It was a custom that when the mayor would come out of his office, people would remain standing at the doorsteps of their house to see where he stops. He would calmly convey the news and leave the family to mourn the death.

In Britain, the news of a soldier's death was communicated by a letter, and of an officer by a telegram, while in Australia the priest performed the same duty.

Traditionally in Indian subcontinent, the death of a general or a high military official was expressed in an elegy (marsiya). One of the famous elegies is of Amir Khusru, which he composed on the death of Sultan Muhammad Shaheed, the son of Balban. The Sultan was killed fighting the Mongols. Whew Khusru recited the elegy in the court, the audience wept bitterly, except Sultan Balban, the father who kept a complete control on his emotions to show to his courtiers that, as a king, he was above the ordinary people. However, history says that he mourned and wept when he was alone in his chamber.

Recently, we have observed a new trend in the mourning culture. In the Kargil conflict, when the bodies of soldiers were brought to their families, the media teams rushed there and sought aggrieved families' opinion about the killings. The poor father, mother or brother has no other option but to say that they were proud of their son or brother and ready to sacrifice more for the country. The whole show was done in such away that all that became a nauseating act. The families were compelled to hide their grief and display brazen form of patriotism.

The same culture was developed by the jehadi organizations in Pakistan. When a young 'mujahid' died in Kashmir or Afghanistan, the concerned group, instead offering condolence, congratulated the family on 'martyrdom' of their relative. Such was the pressure of the culture that if somebody visited for condolence, the family rebuked him and said that that

was a moment of pride for them. Soon everybody accented it and then whenever the news of killing of some youth reached his town, relatives and friends congratulated the family and distributed sweets to celebrate it. It is customary that the streets, where family of the dead lived, were named after the 'martyr'. The religious interpretation of this culture was that martyrs never die; they live an eternal life, therefore, their departure from this world should not be mourned.

The characteristics of this culture is that personal grief is not important. What is the grief of an individual is the pride of a community. A martyr no more remains property of the family but of his organisation. And by celebrating martyrdom, it inspired others to emulate him and desire for that glorious death.

However, the tragic part of this culture is that the family has to endure its sorrow and grief privately and mourn the death silently. While in case of natural death there are no such rituals. No hypocrisy and no artificiality.

The writer is a leading analyst of history.

America: A New World
Without A Past

When the American continent was discovered, it was symbolized as the New World with a new age which in turn was regarded as a new beginning and a new life for mankind.

Its discovery distinguished it from the Old World which represented a world full of corruption, sin, crime, hatred and prejudice. Those who migrated to the New World were those who were discriminated and persecuted, for example the Catholics of England and Protestants of France. Along with these two other sects and communities that were not tolerated in their respective countries found the New World as a God sent opportunity to take refuge from the injustices and humiliation which they had to face in their native countries. Similarly, there were the thrill-seekers who wanted to take the risk and earn a good and dignified living there. As all of them arrived to the new world for a fresh beginning, their approach to the past was very negative.

They did not like to see back to their past, rather forward to the future. As most of them were victims, either because of their views or their social status, they did not have good memories of the past. What little they remembered those were mostly bitter memories.

Once in the new land, their main concern was how to get rid of this ugly past and not allow it to deter their present and their future. The intellectuals as well as the politicians have expressed, in their writings and speeches, these sentiments of the immigrants.

R.W.B. Lewis, a historian writes, "Our national birth was the beginning of a new history...which separates us from the past and connects with the future."

"Therefore, the main desire of the newly arrived people was how to liberate them from the weight of dead men's thought."

Thomas Jefferson, who was also the President of the USA, once remarked that the present of the USA should be as independent of the past as the USA from Europe.

"We must consider each generation as a distinct nation. The dead should not be allowed to rule over living."

The question is that why the newly arrived people in the New World were anti-past and not interested to make it a part of their life? The reason is that the majority of those who came to America belonged to the unprivileged classes and suffered by the rule of the autocrats and aristocracy. Therefore they had a past that had no pleasant memories and no inspiring events. That was the reason they wanted to scrap it all together and replace it with a bright future which they thought was waiting for them.

Secondly, the past was only useful to the nobility and ruling classes to get sanction of their authority on the basis of their birth, lineage and dynasty. It endowed elite classes a sense of destiny and a mission that subsequently led them to exploit weaker classes for their interest. These experiences of the past made the subordinate classes hostile and enemy of it. As there was no need for such sanction to improve their life or raise social status, the new comers relied on their merit and hard labour to achieve success. There was no need to be proud on lineage or family. Their status was going to be determined by their initiatives and work. That is why the past was useless to them. For as one historian aptly writes, "the past should be unaffected by the present. It is the duty of the historians to get rid of its inviolability rather than to invade it with present preoccupations."

Anti-past created an attitude of against history. What J.H. Plumb wrote about Europe, was correctly applied to America. "The past becomes...a matter of curiosity, of nostalgia, a sentimentality...The strength of the past in all aspects of life is far, far weaker than it was a generation ago. Indeed few societies have ever had a past in such a galloping dissolution as this." Therefore, once the past became useless for the early

Americans, they started their new life with a clean slate, without looking back.

Another reason for the hostility towards the past was to de-link the new country from Europe. As almost all of the immigrants came from Europe, they brought the European culture and values along with them that became a great hurdle in creating their own identity. The affluent classes used to send their children to Europe for education and to learn its culture. There was such a dominating influence of Europe that their politicians and intellectuals soon realized that without cutting their roots from Europe it was difficult for them to construct an American nation. These were the reasons that a new sense of American patriotism was created and conscious attempts were made to produce separate an American culture. A new group of historians rejected the European influence in making their political and social institutions.

F.J. Turner declared, "American democracy was born of no theorist's dream. It came out of the American forest."

It is said that those nations who have no burden of the past, look forward and develop with speed because they are motivated by a brilliant future in comparison to those who have a glorious past they dream of past greatness that subsequently make them passive. In such cases they always think in term of revival and not to invent, innovate and. build something new. That is why we find, that in the early phase of the American history there was no conflict between the new or old traditions. They had to build their institutions and traditions according to their needs as they were not obsessed with the past traditions and freely made new experiments in political and social affairs.

However the process has taken a new turn. Now the Americans have their own past, a past which comes in their life with full force and warns them that the New World remains no more new; it is aging and becoming old.

America: War of Independence or Revolution?

In the early history writings of America, historians and politicians termed their struggle against Britain as a war of independence.

Later on, they changed it and started referring to it as the American Revolution. There is a sharp difference between these two terms: war of independence is fought against a foreign colonial power by a colonized country. The colony rebels against the colonial power and makes attempts to liberate itself from its clutches and become free and independent. Revolution, on the other hand, is internal matter of a country and occurs as a result of division between the rich and the poor. Or some groups or sections of a society overthrow their government with the help of an armed struggle. Generally, it is bloody and not peaceful.

In case of independence from colonial rule, the colonized country may retain the colonial legacy, but in case of revolution, the past legacy is totally rejected and a new structure is: shaped, incorporating revolutionary ideas.

Keeping in view this difference between independence and revolution, it is clear that the war of American colonies against England was not a revolution but a war of independence. The change in name is actually the result of the French Revolution that inspired Europeans and Americans by its results. The term 'revolution' became not only respectable but also romantic and to express readiness to bring about rapid changes in society.

American historians, having a deep sense of patriotism, glorify the war of independence and attribute their success as a victory of freedom over tyranny and injustice. Bancroft, the famous American historian calls it the culmination of a long, divinely-inspired progress—the triumph of freedom and democracy. However, this view is challenged by Progressive

historians who regard it as a social movement against the mother country and a protest of democrats against the elite class.

The common people who participated in the freedom movement and fought during the struggle against England, after independence, realized that what they hoped by liberation was not in their favour. The leaders who gathered to frame a Constitution for the new independent country were not friends of the people but belonged to the elite and rich classes solely interested in protecting and preserving their property and wealth.

This was evident from the absence of Thomas Paine, the author of *Common Sense,* whose writings created great political consciousness during the struggle against England; John Hancock, the revolutionary leader and Samuel Adam, an agitator. They were not invited to attend the convention. There were no delegates from the poor and unprivileged sections of society. The majority of the delegates were landowners, lawyers, businessmen, speculators, bankers and planters. These privileged and aristocrat people wanted a kind of constitution that could fulfill their dreams.

What these delegates expressed in the convention reflected their design for future America. For example, Charles Pinckney, a planter, suggested that only a person who possessed $100,000 should be eligible for the post of President. James Murry Mason, a lawyer, declared "We have been too democrat...Let us beware of going too far to the opposite extreme." All of them believed that the masses were nothing but 'the dirty mob'. Therefore, they were afraid of the crowd and express it thus: "The crowd is beginning to think and reason. Poor reptiles! They warm themselves in the sun, and the next moment they will bite...the gentry is beginning to fear them."

It was also believed that people were not fit for democracy. Jeremy Belknap, a clergyman from New England, wrote to his friend: "We should uphold as a principle the fact that the government derives from the people, but oblige the people to realize that they are not fit to govern themselves."

The result of these ideas was that the new American Constitution was framed and drafted, keeping the interest of elite classes. It was a triumph of conservatism. That is why the liberal and progressive called it a 'gilded trap'. It protected the

private property and wealth of the rich classes. In the early draft there was no Bill of Rights. Later on, within two years, ten amendments were made which included freedom of worship, speech, press, assembly, petition, to bear arms, etc. Fernand Braudel, the French historian, comments that: "As for society, there was no question of abolishing privileges and certainly not those of property, which was sacrosanct; but care would be taken to ensure the road to privilege—i.e. wealth—was open to all. That, surely, would be easy in a vast and still 'new' country like America."

As a result, the deprived, poor and unprivileged classes reacted. One manifestation of their reaction was Shays' Rebellion of 1786-87. A group of farmers staged an armed revolt against the injustices of Massachusetts state government. The reason for their revolt was the imposition of war taxes on farmers. Their argument was, that the wealthy people who had lent money to the state, would be benefited, but the poor farmers would not be. The revolt reflected the sentiments of the poor farmers, small traders and common people who sacrificed and got nothing in the end as a result of independence. The Shays' Revolt was crushed and the privileged classes stabilized their hold over the government and its institutions.

The war of independence profited the propertied classes and not the common people. Political change merely replaced the local ruling class instead of a foreign one. The reward of independence was enjoyed by those who already had power and resources and resisted sharing these privileges with the ordinary people.

America's New Frontier

Frontier may be defined as a line, a belt, an area or even a state of mind. However, in popular perception, frontier is considered a line that divides two countries and demarcates their boundaries. Throughout history, boundaries of any country never remained static but changed from time to time and as a result of it, countries either shrank or expanded in size.

Hunger of land motivated the powerful countries to wage war against the weak and usurp and occupy their land. Wars, therefore, were fought for land and people were sacrificed in the name of religion or patriotism to fulfil the ambitions of aggressive states and nations.

In the history of the United States, the definition of frontier is different than the classical one. According to the earlier American concept; the frontier divided their country into settled and unsettled areas. During this phase what was beyond their settled areas was empty, barren, and uninhabited, and therefore justifiable to be occupied by the newcomer white settlers. Indian tribes living in these areas were regarded as nomads and pastorals who had no cities and urban centers. Thus they justified the occupation of land as the conflict between settlement and wilderness.

The westward movement in the history of America projects the image of frontiersmen, who pushed the frontier and established their settlements, as heroes and explorers. This romanticization of the West is indicated in the literature, films and music. The 'Wild West' became a symbol of romance and imaginative speculations that persisted from generations to generation of American nation. However, on the other hand, the image of the Indians is that they were cruel, bloodthirsty and villain. The binary division between good and evil justified the civilized whites to use all methods against the evil Indians and wipe them out from the wilderness in the name of civilization.

An American historian, Fredrick Jackson Turner wrote an article, *"Significance of the Frontier in American History"*, which not only gave a new interpretation to the changing frontiers in the ongoing history of America but created a debate among the historians on his analysis of this aspect of the American history. To him the expanding frontier was a process of progress of civilization. The frontiersmen were not only expansionists but also nationalists. They were the people who faced natural challenges as well as the threats of the native Indians and responded forcefully and effectively to them for their survival. As there was no hierarchical society, equality was the characteristic of their lifestyle. In this sense, true democracy was the product of the West.

Another important phenomenon of the frontiersmen was their individualism and personal freedom. As there was no strong control of the state, the individual developed a strong character to have confidence in him rather than to depend on state support and. protection.

He also points out the impact of the expanding frontier on the rest of the country. On the basis of his analysis, the West absorbed the excessive population that enabled the East to maintain high standard of life and economic prosperity. The West also integrated the dissenters and opponents of the system that allowed the state to implement its policies without any controversy and facing any trouble. He concludes that the overall result of the Westward movement was that the East economically acquired stability and politically it remained calm.

What is missing in Turner's article is the fate of the native Indians. What happened to them? Was the process of: expansion of frontier peaceful? The impression which article and other history textbooks give is that there was no settlement, the land was unused and without any claim. Historically, it is not true.

There were the Indian tribes who were settled and engaged in cultivation. As a result of coming of the frontiersmen, their settlements were uprooted and their population was either massacred or pushed ahead, The Indians were not passive. They resisted and fought bravely to save their culture and land but failed because of superior technology of the

whites. After a battle with the Indian tribe known as the Black Hawk, an American soldier observed, "It was a horrid sight to witness little children, wounded and suffering the most excruciating pain, although they were of the savage enemy."

It is interesting that in the history books it were the Indians who were threat to the whites and not the whites that killed them, wiped out their villages, destroyed the game on which the Indian depended, and burned their fields. In spite of this, the Indians were the aggressors and the whites were the defenders. Andrew Jackson, the future President of USA earned his reputation in the West as a fighter against the Indians and their destroyer. It is from the West that the famous saying became popular comes that says "a good Indian is a dead Indian." Abraham Lincoln also served as a captain in the army that fought the Indians.

So the killers and murderers of the Indians became the heroes of white America. That was the gift of the western wilderness to the American history.

A stage came when the expansion of the frontier came to an end. The wilderness had transformed into a zone of civilization. After it, the question was: What next? In response of it, some say that the energy of the American people should be spent in making the country more powerful in economic and political terms. Some say that the whole concept of the frontier should be changed. In the words of historian Robert E. Riegel, "Turner himself went a step further and began to look for new frontiers, as in the arts, sciences, and politics, that might replace the old economic outlet of free land."

Turner, in the end of his article, points outs: "What is needed is the multiplication of motives for ambition and the opening of new lines of achievement for the strongest." That is how the Americans, after exhausting the resources of exploiting their own land, turned to the Old World and opened the new extra-territorial frontiers to dominate culturally, economically and politically.

Roots of American Imperialism

War brings disaster; it disrupts normal routine of life, deprives people of enjoyment, uproots them from their ancestral homes and makes them refugees to live in a state of fear and insecurity. However, there are people who believe that war is the only instrument which makes people active, inventive, and inspires them to use their hidden potentialities. There is third approach towards war and its impact on· society. It is argued that it gives boost to trade and commerce and improves the economic condition of people. This attitude is clearly evident in the history of the United States when there was war against Spain in 1898. The war not only created xenophobia in the American society and united the disgruntled elements of the South and North America together but also produced war heroes to be revered and adored for their courage and bravery. However, the most important reaction was of the American capitalists and industrialists who clearly saw the commercial benefits and advantages of the war. An American newspaper 'Webster' published an article entitles "Commercial and Financial benefits of War". After analyzing the results and consequences of the Spanish war of 1898, it pointed out that the war not only increased production of arms and weapons of the American factories but it also benefited the textile mills that supplied uniforms to the soldiers and the contractors who, catering food and drink to the army, earned huge profit in this business. The article further elaborated its points that the war ended unemployment and brought prosperity to the common people by opening various venues for job opportunity. The conclusion was that to maintain this prosperity and high standard of life, the American government should continue the policy of waging war against other countries. Because, as a result of it, not only its arms and weapons manufacturing factories would continue to produce more but also the American capitalists would find new markets in war torn countries without much competition.

In June 1898, the same newspaper published another article that outlined the new economic policy for the United

States. As a new and emerging industrial country, US were in need to search new markets for its manufactured goods. The best possible solution was to find out these markets in economically backward countries. In this context, the paper pointed out China as a potential country, but also warned that in order to capture Chinese markets, America had to come into contact with other industrial European countries that were already there. Therefore, it was prudent to make the US navy strong and well equipped in order to compete and fight to protect the economic interests against other colonial powers.

The paper further pointed out the significance of the colonies that would not only provide markets and source of raw material but also play important role from strategic and defence point of view. Once, a colonial power establishes its political domination over a colony, it would engage to improve its transport and communication system, built new buildings, ports, and roads. The beneficiaries of these public works would be American contractors, experts and consultants. Once, a colony economically becomes prosperous, it would produce a consumer class to buy goods produced by the colonial power. Moreover, a colony requires administrators; government officials, and professionals, these post and offices would be filled by the American educated youths. This was the excellent solution to end unemployment among the educated classes.

The same newspaper, elaborating its points, warned that in the acquired colonies people should not be given freedom of. expression. The American government followed the advice when she affiliated Alaska, New Mexico and Arizona states to the union.

In the early 20th century, there was a debate in America how to invest the accumulated capital safely in other countries. One point of view was that the American industrialists, who had formed trust in order to protect their capital, stagnated it, therefore, there was a need to liberate capital by fragmentation of these trust and to invest it in economically backward countries. The other point of view was that the trusts, as the repository of capital, were powerful to compete with other industrial nations, therefore, there was a need to follow an aggressive policy to acquire new colonies and invest capital there.

An American newspaper 'Springfield' representing the interest of the American capitalists, advised the government that under the new and changing situation to capture and conquer a colony and to bring it under direct political control was not economically viable. On the contrary it was a financial burden. Thereupon, the best possible way was to control their markets. The paper then outlined the Policy that how to get hold of new markets. Accordingly an imperialist power should be militarily well equipped by modern weapons; it should keep a large army to maintain its domination and influence; send its envoys and diplomats to those countries where it wanted to have markets in order to convince these states to ask loan for their development. Once they ask for loan, and then send the American experts to complete these projects on their behalf. There should be a policy to pressurize them from time to time to pay back loan. To create in them a sense of insecurity; the American naval ships should remain alert on high sea as a show of strength.

The foundation of the American imperialism that was laid down in the 19th century became strong and matured in the 20th century. The American industrialists protected their interests with the help of the American government's foreign and domestic policies. The important aspect of their policy was that wherever, they invested their capital; they curbed the political freedom of people. They were afraid of people's protest and power and regarded political consciousness a great obstacle to their planning. Military dictatorships and authoritarians governments suited them because it was easy to bribe and corrupt the elite classes and converted them as their collaborators.

Keeping in view this background, we can easily understand that why American government is always eager to wage a war? According to its perspective, war opens new venues for its economy, and provides chances to monopolise the natural resources of other countries. Recent example was Iraqi war that brought an economic boom to America. However, the present crisis has brought the American government to a quite new situation. So, let us see how America is going to make the Afghan war profitable to its capitalists and industrialists.

Writing Black History in America

> *It was, however, a bad way to start. It encouraged the belief that American history—its institutions, its values, its people was one thing and that racial slavery and oppression were different stories. Nothing so embarrassing, however, nothing so fundamentally contradictory to the social ethos, can be kept at a discrete distance for long. It will intrude, and rudely. Nathan I. Huggins in Deforming Mirror of Truth.*

When history is written with national point of view, historians focus their attention to topics which are positive for their nations and ignore those aspects which they regard injurious to National history. American historiography is one of such examples in which history is represented from the white historian's angle and blacks are visible in its historical process.

Especially on the question of slavery, either silence is maintained or it is justified on moral and ethical grounds. The attempts are made by the American historians to marginalize the role of the blacks and exclude them from mainstream history. As long as the history was written by the white historians, the blacks failed to get any place in the American history. However, the situation changed when black historians undertook the task to write their own history and challenge the white man's perspective of their role. Having education, knowledge, and identity consciousness, they are presenting their point of view and asserting their place in history that is not liked by the white historians.

In 1968, the president of the organization of American Historians warned that "a newly formed hyphenate group clamour for historical recognition. Pressure group of history of any kind is deplorable, especially when significant white men are bumped out to make room for much less significant black men in the interest of social harmony."

The important point of discourse between white and black historians is the institution of slavery. The American historian, George Bancroft, who is regarded as the father of the American historiography, exonerates the Americans from having the institution of slavery on the ground that they were not the creator of this institution. On the other hand, they inherited it from the Greeks and the Romans. To him, the American colonists were innocent actors in this drama of cosmic scale. On the question that why slaves are not given their due status in history, the argument is that as slaves they were not independent; they were under the control of their masters, therefore as such they did not produce any culture or perform a commendable role. According to this argument, history records only the role of those sections of society that ate active. The slaves are out of history because they were passive and did not have their own personality.

In response, the black historians have rejected these arguments and asserted that their history is not separate but a part of the mainstream American history. As they have contributed in the development of the American culture and civilization, they should be recognized as active participants in historical process.

They have also rejected this argument that the slaves were under control of their master and did not have their own personality. They proved with evidence that the slaves not only created a culture but also resisted against the system which created slavery and racialism. They have highlighted their contribution to the American history. For example, during the American War of Independence, they fully participated in anti-colonial struggle. In the Boston massacre, the first man who died for American liberty was a slave whose name was Crispus Attucks. When the war broke out against England, there were 5,000 blacks in the army and navy. In the civil war, 40,000 blacks were killed and 2,000 were crippled. However, in spite of their sacrifices, neither were they given equal status in the society nor their services were recognized in the history.

However, the change came after the World War II when, as a resulted decolonization, the African countries became independent. This process of history created a new

consciousness among the American blacks. Africa became a symbol of their lost identity. They searched for their roots there and analyzed the whole history of slavery, racial discrimination, segregation, and prejudices. The new discovery gave them a new spirit and realization that in their dancing and singing they are continuing the African traditions.

The African leaders who fought against the white supremacy and liberated their countries became their heroes. This changed their identity. They no longer remained Negroes or niggers but acquired a respectable name of Afro-American. This new consciousness led them to launch the movement of civil rights. A new slogan of Black Power emerged which gave them confidence and assurance of their existence and strength.

However, the black historians are still grappling with the domination of white men's history as Huggins writes: "Our time seems to call for new myths and a revises master narrative which better inspires and reflects our true condition. Such a new narrative would find inspiration for instance, in an oppressed people who defied social death as slaves and freedmen, insisting on their humanity and creating a new culture despite social consensus that they were a 'brutish sort of people'. Such a new narrative would bring slavery and the persistence oppression of race from the margins to the centre, to define the limits and boundaries of the American Dream. Such a new narrative would oblige us to face the deforming mirror of truth.

The Savage in the Civilized

When all are guilty, no one is confession of collective guilt are the best possible safeguard against the discovery of culprits, and the very magnitude of the crime the best excuse of doing nothing.
Hannah Arendt

In 1990, then US president George Bush—condemning Iraq's invasion of Kuwait—said the whole civilized world was against it. In 2001, his son George W Bush, the current American president, declared that the terrorist act that destroyed the World Trade Center was an attack on the civilised world. Later, the US and its western allies justified their invasion of Afghanistan in the name of civilization.

This division between the civilized and the barbarian, however, is not new. Especially so in the context of American history where, from the very beginning, the European immigrants in the New World— regarding them as the champions of civilization—justified the killing of native Americans in its name.

In American history books, the early period of colonisation is regarded as the period of innocence when the refugees who came from the Old World began a new life that, they claimed, was pure and simple. The record, however, shows that the claim was not true. They brought along with them all the germs of crimes and corruptions from the Old World and soon polluted the New World with their lust and greed.

Their first victims were the native inhabitants of American continent. In South America the natives were mistreated, killed and forced to convert to Christianity. The ancient civilisations of Inca, Maya and Aztec were wiped out in the name of religion. In North America, the European settlers waged a permanent war against the natives to occupy their lands. In the process, they were hunted down like animals and brutally massacred.

The way the American settlers treated the natives did not go un-noticed and the western leaders of the Old World learnt many lessons from it. James W Loewen pointed out "From 1815 on, instead of spreading democracy, we exported the ideology of white supremacy. Gradually we sought American hegemony over Mexico, the Philippines, much of the Caribbean basin, and, indirectly over other nations. Although European nations professed to be shocked by our action on the western frontier, before long they were emulating us. Britain exterminated the Tasmanian aborigines; Germany pursued total war against the Heroes of Namibia... Hitler admired our concentration camps for Indians in the west and often praised to his inner circle the efficiency of America's extermination by starvation and uneven combat as the model for his extermination of Jews and Gypsies.

The processes of dehumanising the other and exterminating them in the name of civilisation continued even after subduing and eliminating the native Americans. It was evident from the US military record in Vietnam. Mai Lai was the famous incident when John Kelly brutally massacred unarmed Vietnamese villagers. Testifying before the Senate Foreign Committee, he frankly told as to how American troops "had personally raped, cut off ears, cut off heads, taped wires from portable telephones to human genitals and turned up the power, cut off limbs, blown up bodies, randomly shot at civilians, razed villages in fashion reminiscent of Genghis Khan, shot cattle and dogs for fun, poisoned food stocks, and generally ravaged the country side of South Vietnam."

This American model has become a good example to all fascist and dictatorial regimes. We can clearly see similarities in the present policy of Israel in Palestine.

But the important thing about all this is that there is no sense of guilt on the part of the perpetrators for their acts of the past as well as of the present. The reason is that all these acts were/are done in the name of civilisation. Whenever it is the civilised versus the savage, it becomes logically and morally correct to eliminate savagery for the sake of civilisation. This also explains why nations repeat these crimes again and again and do not have any sense of guilt at all.

This is despite the fact that the concept of guilt attached to war was widely propagated after the first world war and effectively implemented at the end of second world war in the shape of war crime tribunals. Goring, one of Hitler's ministers, made an interesting remark about these tribunals. When a reporter asked his opinion about them, he replied: "Victors will always be the judge and the vanquished the accused."

So, as long as the America and the western powers are victors and conquerors, they themselves are the judges of their acts which are justified again and again in the name of civilisation. No western colonial power has so far acknowledged the crimes it committed against the colonised people. Both Dyer, who massacred people in Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar, and Kelly, who killed villagers in Vietnam, were glorified by their nations as heroes and saviours.

The unfortunate fact is that the victims of these crime have no knowledge and power to present their case and turn the whole history upside down. In the words of C Vann Woodward: "The new image of the past sometimes replaces the ethnocentrism of the mythmakers with that of victims. Thus "discovery" of the New World becomes "invasion" thereof; "settlement" becomes "conquest", and the Europe the "savages". The "Virgin Land" becomes the "widowed land" the "howling wilderness" a desecrated Indian "hunting park".

But, for the present, what dominates the American public vision is the official version of history which continues to tiff all devastation perpetrated by the Americans in the name of civilization.

Crusades' Truth

Why has George W. Bush use of word 'crusade' upset the Muslims?

When George W. Bush used the word crusade against terrorism after September 11 incident, it reminded the Muslims around the globe of the time when the Western Christians launched a series of campaigns in the 11th century to take back the Holy land which was conquered by the Arabs during the period of Caliph Omar. On November 26, 1095, Pope Urban-II made an emotional speech at Clermont in France, urging the faithful to "enter upon the road to the Holy Sepulcher, wrest it from the wicked race and subject it." There was such an impact of his speech on the audience that they rallied around him and cried 'Deus le volt'-God wills it.

It was the beginning of crusades against the Muslims. Religion was used to arouse the emotions and feelings of hatred to fight in the name of God and fulfil His mission. The first wave of crusade was successful because the Muslim rulers of Syria were fighting against each other. They were defeated by the hordes of crusaders and Jerusalem, the holy city, was captured by the Christians in 1099. What happened to the city is described by Ibn al-Athir, a Muslim historian, in these words:

"In the Masjid Al-Aqsa, the Franks slaughtered more than 70,000 people, among them large number of Imams and Muslim scholars, devout and ascetic men who had left their homelands to live lives of pious seclusion in the holy place. The Franks stripped the Dome of the Rock of more than forty silver candelabra."

A Christian eyewitness later on wrote: "When Raymond later that morning went to visit the Temple area he had to pick his way through corpses and blood that reached up to his knee."

The success of first crusade inspired the holy warriors to launch the second in 1144. However, it failed to get any

significant results. In the third crusade, there was Muslim reaction under Sultan Salahuddin, who fought against them and finally expelled them from Jerusalem in 1187. Instead of killing the defenders and inhabitants of the city, he gave general amnesty and allowed them to leave with their property and belongings. "The Grand Patriarch of Franks left the city with treasures from the Dome of Rock, the Masjid Al-Aqsa, the Church of Resurrection and others, God alone knows the amount of the treasure; also took an equal quantity of money. Salahuddin made no difficulty, when he was advised to sequestrate the whole lot for Islam, replied that he would not go back on his words," writes Ibn-al-Athir.

The most tragic of these crusades was of the children from Germany and France who marched in 1212 towards the Holy land but dispersed on their way. The warlords enslaved most of them who later died of starvation or exhaustion. Finally, the Mamluk Sultans of Egypt defeated the last campaign of crusaders. They expelled them from Syria and the Holy land and restored the Muslim rule. However, the Pope found the concept of crusade useful to crush the dissident and heretic sects of Christianity. There were number of campaigns against them in Europe in which the followers of heretic sects were mercilessly slaughtered. It shows that the Crusade was not only against the Muslims but also against the Christian heretics as well.

Modern historians, after analysing the whole episode, have reached some interesting conclusions. The contemporary historical sources explain that though the Christian powers ruled over the Holy land nearly two centuries yet except a part of the Middle East the rest of the Muslim world remained unaware or unconcerned to the occupation of Al-Quds by the infidels and, therefore, no attempt was made to rally the Muslims for Jehad to liberate it. It is in the modern period that the crusade episode has emerged as a conflict between the East and the West, and subsequently, every move of the West is now regarded symbolically, crusading against the Muslims.

There are scholars who think that the establishment of the state of Israel is an extension of crusade to dominate the Muslim world. They also believe that as the rule of crusaders came to end after two centuries, Israel would face the same fate.

She cannot survive surrounding by the Arab countries in a warlike situation and a day would come when, after exhausting her energies, she would succumb to death.

Secondly, historians say that the crusades were not undertaken for religious reasons; on the contrary, there were political and commercial motives. As result of the law of primogeniture in Europe, the eldest son inherited the property leaving the other sons to earn their own livelihood. The crusades provided an opportunity of those who were deprived of property and territory to earn and carve their principalities in the Holy land. The hunger for land and territory was the leitmotif of the crusades. Moreover, there were commercial motives. That was why Italian merchants heavily invested in the campaign to take their share in the war booty.

There were some positive results of the crusades. For example, trade routes were opened for the European merchants. The lust of profit was so strong that even during the battle the usual business was conducted by the traders. Ibn Jubayr, an Arab traveller, witnessed these activities and remarked that "At times two armies face up each other and form up in battle order; but caravans of Muslims and Christians come and go among them without being stopped."

However, the crusades were not only military clashes but it had cultural and social impact on both sides, especially the Western society influenced and affected culturally. First of all, the crusaders were shocked to find that their adversaries were more civilised and cultured than their priests and princes told them. After living two hundred years side by side, they imbued the oriental culture and took number of things back to Europe to enrich their society. For example, they introduced the system of hospitals, public baths, perfumes, windmills, rugs, carpets, tapestries, muslin, damask, velvet, silk, satin, powder, rosary, compass, custom 'of illumination on ceremonial days and organising knightly sport tournaments. They improved the taste of food by using spices, especially sugar which changed their sweet dishes. In architecture and agriculture, they also leaned new techniques. In literature, the Arabian Nights influenced the European writers. Medicine was also another important branch of knowledge that helped them combat diseases. There was also

racial assimilation. Intermarriages brought both the East and West closer to each other.

The crusade, therefore, was not only military clash but also cultural integration and assimilation that brought religions and cultures closer. Attempts were made on both sides to learn lesson from bloodshed and find out ways to live peacefully.

Though the Muslims emerged victorious and survived as a result of this upheaval, they became very sensitive of the word 'crusade' and believe that the West has not forgotten the humiliation and, therefore, they always look for opportunity to take revenge of their past defeat. When they look the present plight and misery in Palestine, Chechnya, Occupied Kashmir, Bosnia, and now in Afghanistan, they become concerned about their safety and believe that the West is again on the path of crusade. Philip K Hitti writes: "Throughout the Near East, they bequeathed a legacy of ill it will between Moslems and Christians that has not been forgotten." That is why George W. Bush use of 'crusade' has upset the Muslims.

Napoleon: A Model to Dictator

Napoleon as a great conqueror and genius of his time. While a prisoner at St. Helena, he also created his own image as a 'Child of Revolution' and as an 'Heir to Revolution', and on the other hand making himself acceptable to conservatives he once said that he became "the mediator in this struggle of the past against the Revolution".

His nephew Napoleon III, in order to grasp and legitimize his power, further promoted his image of greatness. However, contrary to his image of greatness, Napoleon was an opportunist and the man who established the worst form of dictatorship by using all Draconian methods to crush opposition and misused state institutions for the promotion of his selfish interests and fulfilment of his grandiose ambitions. The form of dictatorship that was shaped by him later on became a model not only for Hitler and Mussolini but also for the emerging dictators of the Third world countries.

Napoleon emerged from anonymity as an army officer when he dispersed a mass demonstration against the government in 1795. The impression he got from this experience was that a mob could be easily handled by using force. This contempt for the masses continued throughout his life. He considered human being as criminals to be controlled by authoritarian methods. He came to power by a coup in 1799 and assumed the post of First Consul. Soon, he became Consul for life and then bestowed upon himself the title of Emperor. In 1807, the title of *le Grand* was also added to his august person.

As a dictator, he fully realized the importance of publicity and propaganda. Therefore, first and foremost action that was taken by him was to bring the press under state control. The newspapers were censored and published only that news which suited to his person and to his policies. There was such a control on the press that only news of his victories was

published. People of France remained in complete darkness when the French navy was defeated in the Battle of Trafalgar.

The stringent measures to curb the freedom of press reduced the number of newspapers. In 1810, there were only four. They were just mouthpiece of government and published selected news. Not only newspapers but also magazine which were also not spared. There were nearly 100 magazines which were published from the different provinces of France. He banned them all and instructed the government to publish its own magazine. Thus, leaving no opportunity to people to know any other thing except government sponsored information. Publishers were also victimized by the policy of censorship. Consequently, their number was reduced to 60. To survive in its business, every publisher had to take an oath not to publish any book against the government or Napoleon. These measures, subsequently, led to the intellectual bankruptcy of the French society.

He was also fully aware of the importance of education. That is why he changed the whole curriculum and devised it in such a way as to inculcate the loyalty to the emperor. He was not interested in educating the poor and women. Therefore, the educational institutions that were established served only the elite of the society.

To check the activities of his opponents, he gave extensive powers to the intelligence agencies. They had the authority to enter people's houses and search. People could be arrested on mere suspicion without warrant and put in prison without trial. As a result of this policy, in 1814 there were 2500 political prisoners languishing in jails.

Napoleon, very cleverly, not only promoted his image by the controlled press but by the paintings of David and Gericault which displayed him on horseback in a posture of conqueror. To show his outward respect to democratic institutions, he successfully used the method of plebiscite to win the popular support. For example, in 1814, for the establishment of his Empire he got 3.57 million favourable votes while only 2,569 voted against it.

After assuming the title of Emperor, he revived the model of the absolute king and upheld the concept of 'Divine

Right'. The French church declared "God has established him as our sovereign and has made him the minister of His power and His image on earth." To have a support base he created his own hereditary nobility which was loyal to him. He refrained from using the slogans of the Revolutions and also regarded the Declaration of Rights as an obstacle to his authority. He was convinced that poor and uneducated people could be easily mobilized by emotional slogans and in the name of patriotism. He used these tactics successfully throughout his career.

Napoleon also understood the importance of religion and therefore used it to achieve his political motives. He argued that: "Societies cannot exist without inequality of fortunes, and inequality of fortunes cannot exist without religion. When a man is dying of hunger alongside another' who stuffs him, it is impossible to make him accede to the difference unless there is an authority, which says to him: 'God wishes it thus'."

Believing that religion fulfilled a social function, he brought it under the control of state and used it to empower state institutions and to uphold the hierarchical structure of society.

The whole image of his braver is also based on concocted facts. In reality, he betrayed his army whenever it was in crisis and needed his support. For example, in 1799, when he faced defeat in Egypt, he left his army and escaped to France. It happened in 1812 in Russia where his grand army perished and he shamelessly left it in chaos and came back. In fact, the Empire, which he created, was based on usurpation and plunder. When he conquered a country, he looted its antiquities and brought to France as in case of Egypt and Italy. He also elevated his family members and close friends to the status of rulers, regardless of the consent of conquered nations.

Even after his death, his nephew who brought his body from St. Helena to Paris and buried it with state honour used his name. Though he brought disaster to France, sacrificed thousand of soldiers to fulfil his dream of creating a great Empire, yet he is regarded as great and a hero not only to the French but many others who are charmed by his image, not knowing of his crimes and dictatorial methods. Again, it is ironic that he still inspires dictators who adopt his model and bring disaster not only to their country but also their own person.

Lincoln's Stand on Slavery

It is important to note that the character and person of politicians cannot be determined by their one or two speeches or statements. They, generally, have many faces and change their stand according to the needs of time and opinion of people. They believe in success rather than in upholding moral values.

This attitude is indicated by a comment of Truman one of the presidents of the USA. When asked why was he supporting Israel knowing that it was not a just cause, his reply was: "I don't have Arabs in my constituency".

Therefore, it is fully evident from the history of politicians that in order to fulfil their political motives, they sacrifice moral values and principles.

Historians, on the other hand, in compliance to the interests of the ruling classes, construct the images of political personalities in such a way as to make them appear as great figures in history. For example, what we learn from history about Lincoln is that he was a great humanitarian who fought civil war in order to emancipate slaves. A deep analysis of his person and ideas shows that this image is not fully true. Lincoln, like his predecessors and contemporaries, was not free from racial prejudices. This was apparent when he was contesting for the presidential election against Stephen Douglas, who was openly against the blacks. In July 9, 1858 Douglas declared: "In my opinion, this government of ours is founded on the white basis. It was made by the white man, for the benefit of the white man, to be administered by white men."

Not to loose popular support and to please his audience, Lincoln, debating with Douglas in Charleston, expressed his racist views in these words: "I am not, nor ever have been, in favour of bringing about the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not nor ever have been in favour of making voters or jurors of Negroes."

Again, on the eve of the civil war, Lincoln emphatically said in 1862: "My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, it is not either to save or to destroy slavery."

In view of his statement, the correct interpretation is that in real terms, Lincoln fought the civil war to save and protect the unity of America and not for abolition of slavery. Slaves were emancipated indirectly as a result of the war and also because there were economic reasons to get rid of this institution which no longer remained economically viable. The institution of slavery was useful in the early days of the European arrivals in the new world. At that time, they wanted cheap labour and found the solution in bringing Africans as slaves to work in their plantations. However, by the passage of time, changes occurred as a result of technological inventions and spread of industrialization. The North emerged as an industrial zone while the south remained agricultural depended on slave labour. This created a cultural gulf between these two regions. The owners of plantations, living in palatial houses aristocratically, were different from the northern industrialists.

Besides this difference, there were also radical changes in the southern economic structure that made it vulnerable to face the new challenges. Over use of land exhausted the capacity of the soil to produce more. One crop economy based on cotton production resulted in financial failure and bankruptcy, as the prices were determined by the world market and by the cotton kings. Moreover, the South heavily depended on imported goods from the North. These changes made slavery a, burden to the economy of South.

Further, the investment in slaves became very costly. Approximately, the price of one slave was $1500. If he ran away, it was a loss of all capital invested in buying him. Moreover, in case of disease or epidemic, whole families of slave were wiped out, again a loss of capital which could not be retrieved. Even to feed them became expensive. The result was that the institution of slavery had lost its utility to serve the interests of landholders of the South. It was just a matter of prestige to keep it for their life style.

History shows that when an institution becomes obsolete, there emerge ideas and movements to replace it with

one that fulfils the needs of time. Therefore, economic compulsions appeared in form of humanitarian movement that pleaded the cause of salves and launched abolitionist movement. The case of slavery reached to its culmination on the occasion of the civil war when it had to be decided one-way or other. The war, as a matter of act, was not fought directly on the issue of slavery but on the question of culture. The South represented the aristocratic values of culture and wanted to preserve and protect them. The North regarded it an obstacle to industrial development and progress. It wanted to use the energy of slaves as free labourers. Slavery ended because of economic compulsions and not because of humanitarian impulses. Lincoln became a reluctant advocate for the abolition of slavery.

As history has fully recorded the horrors of the institution of slavery, public opinion has also been changed. Consequently, when people came to know that Washington and Thomas Jefferson owned slaves, they were shocked. The same case was of Lincoln. He was the product of his time and had racist and colour prejudices. Why is this aspect of Lincoln not told to the students and generally to the people? James W. Lowen gives its explanation in his book *Lies my teacher told Me*. He writes: "Textbooks authors protect us from a racist Lincoln. By so doing, they diminish students' capacity to recognize racism as a force in American life. For if Lincoln could be racist, then so might the rest of us be. And if Lincoln transcend racism, as he did on occasion, then so might the rest of us."

Germany's Fuhrer

The man who left a perfect model of a Fascist state, is still inspiring third world dictators to imitate him and use political power to fulfil their personal interest

Recently there was a discussion in the Time magazine about who should be nominated as the man of millennium. Among others, the name of Hitler was also suggested. Perhaps the idea to declare him the man of the millennium has been since dropped. However, nobody can deny the impact of his rise and fall on the modern history. The man who left a perfect model of a Fascist state, is still inspiring third world dictators to imitate him and use political power to fulfil their personal interest.

Moreover, his name is so deeply entrenched in modern German history that it has become an uphill task for the German historians to get rid of him and overcome the sense of guilt—the result of the Nazi atrocities.

There are different interpretations among German historians of the Hitler phenomenon. One interpretation is that Hitler, as an individual, was responsible for each and every thing and the German nation was not aware of what was going on. This absolved the German people who otherwise fully supported the Nazi regime. Another interpretation is that the people continuously resisted Hitler and suffered under him like others. The third interpretation considers the rise of Hitler as an aberration and not a part of German history.

However, in a broader perspective the historians see the rise of Hitler as a result of the Treaty of Versailles (1919) which contained humiliating terms for Germany. It was regarded by the General as *doich stoss* or 'dagger in the back'. The inflation which followed the war caused immense financial problems, especially, for the middle class. Consequently, they became fervent supporters of Hitler and thought he would help them regain their lost position. The situation further deteriorated when

a political vacuum emerged in which a number of political parties along with their private armies started to fight each other.

Under these circumstances, when the National Socialist Party announced ending the Treaty of Versailles, to have *lebensraum* (space for living) for the German population, and to control the economic and intellectual domination of the Jews, it got the support of different sections and classes of the German society.

Hitler first tried to grab power through violence. In 1923 he made the famous *putsch* in Munich, but failed and was imprisoned for a brief period. After that he changed his policy and decided to come to power through constitutional ways and means. In these efforts he was supported by the leading industrialists who were against communists and wanted to use Hitler for their protection.

To win the elections he launched a mass campaign and used all his rhetoric against Jews, socialists and communist. In the 1928 election his party won 2.6 of the total votes (12 seats); in 1930, 18.3 per cent votes (107 seats), in July 1932, 37.3 (230 seats), and in November 1932, 33.3 votes (196 seat).

In 1933 Hitler became the Chancellor of Germany. After the death of President Hindenburg in 1934, he also assumed the office of President and hence became the most powerful man in Germany.

To perpetuate his power Hitler took several steps: he completely rejected democracy and wiped out all its institutions and traditions, which consequently helped the capitalists to exploit the workers. To get public support he organised huge rallies and marches in which party symbols and banners were displayed to create a sense of loyalty among the party workers. He held the Jews and communists responsible for all problems weakening the German society. Therefore, he directed the hatred of the German people towards these groups. He inducted among the Germans violent nationalism and respect for authority.

Once he had the public support, he organised the state so that it was absolutely monopolised by him. After coming to power, he moved the Enabling Bill in the Reichstag which

authorised the government to pass laws without consulting the Reichstag. It was passed with little opposition.

There was only one party, Hitler's Nazi party, which had absolute power in and outside the government. Nazi governments were appointed in all states. Opposition parties were banned. Socialist leaders were arrested. Trade unions were dissolved. To crush all opposition he set up secret agencies like the S.A. (*Sturm Abteilung*) and S.S. (*Schutz Staffel*) and Gestapo. Even the Judiciary was completely controlled by the party with the result that opponents were sentenced without proper judicial procedure. Torture and execution became common.

To eliminate the Jews, the Ancestral Heritage Office was established to determine racial identity. The Jews were not only expelled from all posts and offices but thrown out of educational institutions. Later on they were kept in concentration camps. The party also interfered in cultural and academic domains—art, architecture, literature, film, and the academic world of universities. All literature thought to be against Nazi ideology was publicly burnt.

To keep the image of good governance and to justify all actions, new and subtle methods of propaganda were used. Goebbels controlled the mass media and propagated benevolent and enlightened images of the Fuhrer and the party.

Interestingly, in his early period, Hitler was supported by the Americans and the British governments because of his anti-communist rhetoric. In 1938 Churchill in an open letter published in the *Times*, wrote about Hitler, "were England to suffer a national disaster comparable to that of Germany in 1918, I should pray God to send us a man of your strength of mind and will."

Hitler became a demon only when he directed his wrath towards Britain and France. Otherwise he was patronised by the European industrialists to fight against Russia and 'save Europe from the danger of communalism.

Germany suffered as a result of Nazi dictatorship. All leading intellectuals and scientists left Germany for other countries which made the intellectual and academic life barren and dull. All creativity was directed towards promoting the Nazi ideology. Flattery and sycophancy became the gateways for

success. Racial discrimination eliminated the multi-cultural dimension of society. Surveillance inducted fear among all citizens who were terrified of the secret agencies.

Such was the life when war was imposed on the people. The early victories created euphoria but soon the tables were turned and the whole country suffered. Hitler saved himself by committing suicide but the nation experienced the humiliation and horrors of occupation by the victorious armies.

History is ready to provide lessons—any attempt to concentrate power in the hands of one person is disastrous for the country and society. For overall development, a society needs freedom and not ideological restrictions. A dictatorial government loses credibility whenever it monopolises information and uses it for its own vested interest. Policies of expansionism and consequent involvements in war not only exhaust the resources of the country but disintegrate it territorially.

How Many Qassims, Ghaznviz, And Ghoris Do We Need?

Last week when I was passing through the Lahore Mall, I saw a banner fluttering with a bold headline 'We welcome Parvez Musharraf as a modern Muhammad bin Qasim'. The banner was manifest of historical consciousness of our society. I started wondering why our nation always thinks in terms of a strong man as a deliverer? Why do we construct a past that entirely belongs to the conquerors and invaders? Why do we remember Mah-mud of Ghazna and not al-Biruni, Ibn Sina, or Firdusi? This attitude and approach to cognate history is reflective of the psyche of our people shaped by continuous mani- pu-lation of history by the state.

Political history, as a major discipline, dominates our history textbooks. Popular history fiction by writers like Sharar or. Nasim Hijazi contains Muslim heroic figures who em-body the essentials of a brave hero to crush the enemy and manifest courage, mag- nanimity, and tolerance towards the oppressed. Such qualities, by the end of the narrative, are rewarded by way of marrying the hero off to a beautiful woman, who is generally non-Muslim.

Equally fascinating is the play of historical films that heighten the drama of·war and con-quest to popularise the past events that gratify the sense of history in popular conscious-ness. Naturally such commercial ventures fetch enormous amount of money to producers and film industry at large.

Muhammad b. Qasim, Mahmud of Ghazna, and hihabuddin Ghori emerged as powerful symbols in Muslim politics in the context of the 1930s' communal atmosphere in India. Interestingly they continue to be used as symbols of perfect

Muslim heroes who have the ability to restore peace and order through their belligerence. Such manipulation is of course suitable to those rulers who seize power by force. They legitimate their rule by manipulating figures of war and power from our past. The grave impact of which is that our past, not just in popular consciousness, but in academics and school education, is re-duced to the past of conquerors and aggressors. Not surprisingly then it has the strongest appeal to the people. Such a version of history gives our society a temporary sense of pride and a satisfaction in bygone greatness nurtures self-delusion and escape in the past that lives no more.

18th Century was the turning point in the history of the Muslim societies. Owing to the process of colonization the Safavi, the Mughal, and the Ottomons were on the decline. Having lost the power and prestige, Muslim societies harked back to their past glories to find images of victors and conquerors who had built great empires. Such imagination was a kind of redemption from colonial bondage, and a source of hope that such heroic personas would redeem them from political enslavement, social and cultural decay. The Indian Muslims imagined the Ottoman Empire to be a powerful constant.

Undoubtedly it had projected power during the time of Sultan Muhammad Fateh and Sulaiman the Magnificent, but its position in the political world in the twentieth century had changed. Not recognizing such a change, the Indian Muslims acclaimed the Ottoman Caliph as their protector. During the Balkan wars in 1912-13, Maulana Azad's paper al-Hilal started to publish the heroic encounters of the Turkish generals who fought against the Christians. It served as an inspiration to the Muslim community in India. However, the defeat and surrender of the Caliph in the First World War greatly disap-pointed them.

In an atmosphere of loss and grief when Ghazi Anwar Pasha got killed in his mission to unite all the Turkish speaking people in Central Asia, the Indian Muslims turned him in to a mujahid and later martry. The other hero that emerged as victor was Mustafa Kamal who restored the lost dignity of the Turkish nation by

defending his country against the allied invasion. Both Pasha and Kamal, despite their antithetical views, became the he-roes of the Muslims of the subcontinent. Out of the two, Mustafa Kamal continues to be a model for Muslim rulers and leaders. Riza Shah, the founder of Pahlawi dynasty of Iran, and Amir Habibullah of Afghanistan, had the aspiration to emulate him to moder nize their countries but circumvented the process of modernization due to their involvement in corruption. Similarly Jinnah, Ayub, and now Paervez Musharraf aspire to espo use the values of Ataturk, the great man and hero.

Ataturk, however, is viewed as a destroyer of religion and tradition by the religious extr- emists. His endeavour to secularize and modernize Turkey is anathema to the bearers of religious extremism. The religious extremist parties have rejected Ataturk as their hero and take pride in the figures of Muhammad b. Qasim, Mahmud of Ghazna, and Shihab uddin Ghori. They also became relevant in the context of Indian-Pakistani conflict: the conquerors who defeated the Hindus and propagated and established Islam in the Indian subcontinent. This also shows that the historical consciousness of our people is still tilted towards the belief in physical power, not realizing that the days of physical power are over and intellectual creativeness and technological innovation reign supreme.

The consequences of hero worship have resulted in disaster for Pakistan. Following the footsteps of the conquerors, the rulers of Pakistan treated it as a conquered country and, therefore, legitimated plunder and loot of its wealth and resources. The only difference between them and the model conquerors is that in the past the wealth was taken away from India and deposited in the state treasuries of Damascus, Bhagdad, and Ghaznin. Now the Swiss banks or American and Western countries provide safe haven to the Plundered wealth. How can we condemn the modern heroes when we admire the ones of the past on the same deeds? If we justify hero worship, then we have to condone not only their plundered but also endure their rule and sacrifice each and everything to make them great and powerful.

The Builders and the Plunderers

It was a tradition with rulers of the past that whenever they decided to make a city the capital of their empire or province, they developed its defence capability' and administration, commercialised the city and made it a seat of learning. As a result, the town emerged from insignificance to prominence and attracted people to come there in search of opportunity and to make a career.

Keeping this in mind, when we study the history of Lahore and its rulers in the past thousand years, we find that there were rulers who defended the city from foreign invasions, maintained peace and order, and contributed to make it known in art, literature, music, architecture, trade and commerce. But there were also rulers who shamelessly plundered and looted the city and brought disaster to it and its inhabitants. Lahore experienced both types of rulers, withstood all hardships and survived.

The city of Lahore emerged from insignificance and obscurity after the conquest and occupation of the Ghaznavids who changed the character and the landscape of the city. The Ghaznavids made it the centre of their Indian conquests. They encouraged people from Khurasan and Central Asia to come to this city and made it their homeland. Those who migrated were traders, poets, mystics and mendicants. These new arrivals made this city a cosmopolitan where people belonging to different religions were living harmoniously.

Mahmud appointed his favourite slave, Malik Ayaz the governor of Lahore. He built walls around the city to make it safe and secure. He also constructed a fort for his residence to keep garrison to defend it. On this account he is regarded as the founder of the modern Lahore. When the Ghaznavid Empire disintegrated and its rival Seljuqs defeated its rulers, Masud II (1099-1114) decided to make Lahore his seat of government.

Finally the royal family took refuge in the city. The last ruler, Khusro Shah ruled there till the Ghorid ruler defeated him.

Lahore assumed strategic importance during the Sultanate period. The first ruler Qutbuddin Aibak spent his last days here in order to defend the city against his rival Tajuddin Yildiz. He died playing polo and was buried in the city. Throughout the Sultanate period, the city passed through a number of political vicissitudes and disturbances. It experienced repeated Mongol invasions and also witnessed the hoards of Timur in 1392 who came to devastate India. However, by that time, Lahore had become a strong defence against the invaders from the north west frontiers.

The city of Lahore acquired a new outlook during the Mughal rule. Akbar stayed in the city from 1584 to 1598 and more or less made it his second capital. It became a favourite city of Jahangir whose long stay in the city improved its structure.

During the Mughal rule the whole landscape of Lahore changed. The Mughal emperors built palaces, forts, mosques, tombs, gardens, madaris, and caravansaries. Ali Mardan Khan, who was appointed its governor by Shahjahan laid down the foundation of Shalamar garden and built a number of buildings. Another governor Wazir Khan added beautiful buildings to the city. Dara Shikoh, his heir, apparently lived in the city and loved it because it was the residential place of his spiritual mentors Mian Mir and Mullah Shah. His own *haveli* once was a marvel of architecture in the city.

The Mughal governors played active and independent role during the decline of the dynasty, as there were no strong rulers to check them and interfere in their administration. It was a turbulent period because the Sikhs created widespread troubles throughout the Punjab, which threatened safety of the citizens.

During this period two strong governors, Abdul Samad and Zakariya Khan, subdued the Sikh rebellions and maintained peace and order in the city as well as in the province. Especially Zakariya Khan who ruled from 1717 to 1738 enhanced prosperity of the province and made the city affluent. After him, the city and the province faced the invasions of Nadir Shah (1738) and Ahmad Shah Abdali who ravaged the city and the

Punjab. As a result of his rapacity and greed of wealth people suffered terribly. In 1748, his attack was bravely defended by Muin ul Mulk, popularly known as Mir Mannu, who served as the governor of the Mughals. Getting no support from the centre, he had no alternative but to surrender. When he presented himself to the Afghan king, an interesting dialogue took place between the two:

"Why didn't you submit earlier?" asked Abdali.

"I had then another master to serve," replied Mir Mannu.

"Why didn't that master come to your help?"

"He thought his servant could take care of himself."

Abdali changed the topic and asked him another question: "What would you have done if you had captured me?"

"I would have cut off your head and sent it to my master." replied Mir Mannu.

"Now that you are at my mercy, what should I do to you?" asked Abdali.

"If you are a shopkeeper sell me (for ransom), if you are a butcher, kill me, if you are a king, grant me your grace and pardon." Abdali was struck by his boldness and replied: "May God bless you, I pardon you."

Abdali did not only confirm Mir Mannu as the governor but also awarded him the title of Rustam-i- Hind. Mir Mannu died in 1753. His minor son succeeded him but in reality his wife Mughlani Begum assumed full power. She was a wonderful woman of her time. In the opinion of a historian: "She was a lady of remarkable address and daring, and played such an important part in the politics of the Punjab from 1753 to 1757 that she was the pivot around which centered all the political affairs of the country. However, she was opposed by the nobility, which did not like to be ruled by a woman. She also alienated her own family by her involvement in a number of sexual scandals. Though she was supported by Abdali she lost control as a result of strong opposition of nobility.

In subsequent chaos, Adina Beg emerged as a great figure. He successfully dealt with the Afghans, the Sikhs, and the Marathas and assumed viceroyalty of the Punjab in 1758. He was an able administrator and a farsighted statesman. He not only defended the Punjab from internal and external dangers but

also managed finances by collecting revenue and not sparing any default. It is said that: "The villages of defaulters were often plundered and sometimes reduced to ashes."

The province of the Punjab plunged into disorder after the death of Adina Beg. The person who took advantage of this anarchy was Ranjit Singh. He captured Lahore and established the first Sikh kingdom in the Punjab. He ruled from 1799 to 1839. During this period, he not only defended Punjab from the north west but also from the British India His death, however, unleashed the forces of disorder, and the government of British India, taking benefit of the situation, invaded Punjab in 1849 and annexed it.

With the conquest of the British, the nature of the rule changed. It was a foreign rule. There was an inscription on the statue of the first Governor, John Lawrence, which announced the policy about how the new province should be ruled: "Will you be governed by the pen or the sword." Later on, in 1926, the wordings were changed as "with pen and sword I served you."

After the independence our new rulers preferred sword rather than pen to rule.

Is Renaissance Possible in an Islamic Society?

Religious teachings had no place in the new system. This new movement is known in history as humanism, which not only made man dignified but also raised the status of an individual. Now every individual on the basis of his intelligence and hard work tried to achieve something prominent in his field and get fame as well as wealth, In the mediaeval period, chances for individual progress were limited: either he could become a priest or a warrior. Now, the changing European society provided new avenues to individuals.

Renaissance is regarded as a turning point in the history of Europe, because it liberated society from the clutches of the church and paved the way for enlightenment, rationalism, scientific revolution, and individualism. Keeping in view its significance and role in the process of change, the term has become very popular in every society. It is frequently used to indicate change and progress. That is why intellectuals and thinkers of societies where old traditions are deeply rooted desire and hope to have Renaissance to overturn the old structure. The term Renaissance is used often in the recent Islamic history. Some times it is said that the Renaissance has already occurred and transformed it from old to new. Sometimes, it is argued that, to check the process of decline, the only solution is to have Renaissance.

Those who believe that the process of Renaissance can change the course of history in Islamic societies as it changed in Europe fail to understand that every society has its own traditions, values, and norms which require different approaches to change and restructure them. Henceforth, it is not possible for other nations to follow and imitate the European pattern and try to pass through all those stages which had been traversed by Europe. No doubt, the European model gives us an insight into

the process of history, but every civilization has to adopt its own course to change its old structure and obsolete traditions.

In the Islamic world, from Jamaluddin Afghani to the present, many thinkers and intellectuals claimed that it is possible to have a renaissance in Islamic societies to enable the Muslims to struggle against the onslaught of Western culture. In actuality, so far, nothing has happened and old beliefs and dogmas remain. However, charmed by this term, it is used by both modernists and traditionalists. The modernists, by having a Renaissance, want to adopt Western traditions and institutions in order to face the European challenges; while the traditionalists desire to revive the purity of the religion to check the process of modernization. In both cases, they did not make any attempt to understand the true spirit of the European Renaissance. In fact, it was neither for the revival of purity of religion nor for making religion modern or progressive. On the other hand, its motive was to free society from religious dogmatism and rigidity.

In mediaeval Europe, the church dominated society in every sphere of life and did not tolerate any opposition to its ideology. Those who raised any voice against its ideology were condemned as heretics and either burnt at stakes or tortured and executed. The church was very much afraid of new ideas and thoughts, which were regarded as subversive, and dangerous to its existence. To check new thinking, the church controlled education and imparted only those ideas which strengthened its position. It discouraged secular knowledge. Philosophers and scientists were made an outcaste and condemned. The growth of new ideas was controlled by censorship.

The outlook of the church towards the world and man was based on the concept of original sin, which determined the role of man in the universe. The only object of life was to get salvation by abstaining from all pleasures of life. There was no motivation to make this world better and pleasant. Gripped by these concepts and ideas, European society became stagnant and rotten. Deterioration reached a level where society had to decide either to challenge that state of affairs and restructure it or accept the status quo and disappear in the oblivion of history. Instead of accepting death, European society decided to challenge and change the world.

For the change, the European thinkers and philosophe s searched their roots in Greek and Roman civilizations in which man was not an insignificant and inferior creature; on the contrary, he was equal to gods and deities. He kept his dignity even when he sought their help when they failed to fulfil his demands he expressed his anger against them. He quarreled with them, denounced them, and sometime in extreme frustration even abused them.

The Renaissance thinkers needed such a strong man to change the old world. Therefore, their discovery is the discovery of the Man who was not an inferior creature but strong, powerful, self-confident, and capable of undertaking the job. He was sure to make his own destiny. This Renaissance man was so independent and self-willed that he could not be controlled by the church or any divine authority. He was ready to change his world according to his needs, and his needs were to make the world better and prosperous.

To achieve this he required material resources. Therefore, wealth and not poverty became the key to success and happiness. Material comfort created an urge to live longer. To make the body healthy and life longer he had to improve hygienic conditions, find cure for diseases, develop the nutritious value of food, and to take care of his comfort. This new outlook of world and life led to the development of natural and social sciences and humanities. The whole educational system was reconstructed to fulfil these needs.

Religious teachings had no place in the new system. This new movement is known in history as humanism, which not only made man dignified but also raised the status of an individual. Now every individual on the basis of his intelligence and hard work tried to achieve something prominent in his field and get fame as well as wealth. In the mediaeval period, chances for individual progress were limited: either he could become a priest or a warrior. Now, the changing European society provided new avenues to individuals. Those who became wealthy spent their money in constructing monuments in their memory. This also gave a boom to portrait paintings to assert the individual's desire even to live after his death. Every individual wanted to have his own identity rather to be known as a part of his community.

We see that as a whole the culture that was produced by the Renaissance challenged religious authority and its hegemony. The classical ideas of Greek and Roman cultures provided tools to European society to fight against mediaeval society and its ideas. Slowly and gradually, the new ideas based on the classical age overpowered the religious ones and a secular society emerged.

One thing we must keep in mind: The Renaissance was not the revival of Greek and Roman civilizations. On the other hand, it provided bases and grounds to build new ideas and get inspiration from the classical ones.

Keeping in view the process of the Renaissance in Europe which challenged the church and created the humanist movement, we now pose this question: Is it possible to have such a movement in Islamic society? Is it possible to reject divine intervention in human affairs and make man responsible for building his own destiny and change society according to his need on his own authority and will? Is it possible to build a society that would be free from all religious influence and where secular values would determine all aspects of life? It appears doubtful that Islamic societies will accept this formula to get rid of fundamentalism and religious rigidity, liberate individual from divine limits and make him independent to shape his own destiny.

Muslim World's Predicament

The Muslim states are afraid of their people. Therefore, instead of trusting them, they rely on army, police, and intelligence agencies. And whenever a crises erupts, they have to deal with it alone, sans people's support

In the process of history, nations face challenges and crises. If response to these challenges is timely, swift, and forceful, they survive and overcome the crises. Otherwise, they either face destruction or ignominy.

In the case of Muslim society, it first faced intellectual and philosophical challenges in the Eighth and Ninth centuries from the Greeks whose classical literature was translated into Arabic and created doubts and scepticism about faith. As the Islamic societies were dynamic and energetic, they absorbed the Greek learning and used it for the development of their thoughts and ideas. However, the situation was different ·vhen in the 19th and 20th centuries, the Islamic societies encountered the European thoughts as a result of colonisation. At that stage, they failed to respond and were incapable of defending their cultural values and traditions. Even after decolonisation, the political set-up, which the Muslim countries established, was not equipped to adapt to the requirements of the changing world.

The result is that today, nearly all-Muslim countries are facing enormous challenges that threaten their very existence, but the response is neither swift nor forceful. There is no urge to resist, no desire to struggle, and no energy to respond. The question is why there is such insensitivity and lethargy? The answer of this question lies in the power structure of Muslim societies.

Almost all Muslim countries are ruled by either monarchs or dictators—who concentrate all power in their hands, giving no opportunity to other sections of society to play any role in political, social or economic affairs. As a result, the

entire nation becomes hostage to the state. People are just required to obey order and be ready for sacrifice for the interests of the ruling clique. This power structure affects the outlook of society. Instead of participating actively, people become silent spectators only to observe what is coming from the above. Any opposition or any criticism to government is regarded as treason. The dictatorial and autocratic role of the state separates people from power structure and refuses to use their energy to face internal and external challenges. Generally, the Muslim states are afraid of their people. Instead of relying on the support of people, they rely on army, police, and intelligence agencies. So, whenever the crises erupt, the states have to face them role of the without the support of their people.

If this creates a wide gap between the people and the states throughout the Muslim world. What people want, states negate it. What states require, people deny it. Unless this gap is filled, it will be difficult for the states to fight alone and survive. The other course these states adopted is to seek protection from the imperialist powers against the wishes of their own people. It ultimately divides society into two hostile groups i.e. rulers and people.

Under these circumstances, the main concern of a Muslim state is to control its own people. In this regard, two methods are generally adopted by the states. First, to pronounce and implement draconian laws, prohibiting people not to demonstrate their opinion, and involve in any political activity. Politics becomes the domain of elite and a chosen few. Secondly, to indoctrinate people by uncalculating emotions of nationalism and patriotism using popular media such as radio, TV, newspapers and films. In such a situation, the state uses all resources for its own survival rather than to solve the problems of people such as education or health. This makes people illiterate, malnourished, starved, and weak, thereby incapable of fighting either for their own rights and challenging the state structure hostile to them.

The Muslim world cannot come out of these crises unless power structure is reconstructed. The present crises in Afghanistan and Palestine clearly show that very distance between people and the states. It is not sure how long this will

continue. It is also difficult to predict whether there will be popular revolts against the autocratic states or people will keep enduring humiliation, insult, and shame that are hurled on them by powerful nations.

One method that has been adopted by some dissident or rebel groups is the use of terrorism. It is generally adopted when there remains no legal or lawful way to solve problems. It is also said to be a weapon of the weak and helpless against the powerful. However, terrorism does not solve problems, rather it creates more. It is dealt with by the state, which crushed it mercilessly.

An alternative course is that Muslim countries develop their own knowledge system to combat internal as well as external challenges. It is rightly said that knowledge is power because it equips people to argue logically and present their case rationally. In the absence of it, people express their views in terms of anger and emotions. It is evident that we cannot convince other people with emotional language. There is need to present your case with facts and evidence.

There is also a need to understand that why the United States and the western powers are so advanced in their knowledge system and why talented people, instead of benefiting their societies, prefer to go to the west and enrich their knowledge system?

The western countries not only have their own knowledge system but also acquire the knowledge of other countries. For example, the American and western universities have more advanced and developed Departments of South Asia and the Middle East. On Islam and Muslim societies, their research work is of wide range. The Orientalism or the knowledge of the East makes them understand the overall situation of these countries and provide them tools to control them. In contrast, we do not have such institutions and departments to understand the western or American societies. Thus, there is clash between knowledge and ignorance.

Societies need culture to become intellectually mature. If there is restriction on cultural activity, the people's minds become barren. Any society, which lacks creative activity, is not respected by other nations. Societies are respected only when

they contribute to the world culture and civilisation. As an illiterate person is a burden on a society, similarly, a society without culture is a burden on a civilised world.

Restoring Perceptions

September 11 radically changed the image of Islam in the West and it's seen as a religion of violence and war. Now the challenge for the Muslim World is how to change this image

As image of the 'other' is created after a process that entails political, commercial, social and religious relationship and contacts. That is why the image might change from time to time. At some historical stage the image contains prejudice and hostility but at another point in time it becomes positive and friendly. It all depends on the changing relationship of a society with the 'other'.

There is an example of the Jews in the West, once regarded as anti-Christ and pariah for the western society. An image fully reflected in literature and history. To change this image, a systematic effort was made by the Jewish intellectuals and a campaign against anti- Semitism was launched which subsequently improved the image of the Jews. It is now seen as a 'persecuted community', which must be supported and compensated by the western society.

If we trace the history of images of Islam in the western society we find that these images have changed from time to time. In the first phase the image of Islam was of a militant religion that spread with the help of sword. The historical background was provided by the early conquests of Islam, which brought Syria, Lebanon, and whole North Africa under the fold of Islam. Before the conquest these were the Christian dominated areas. Slowly and gradually, the conquests led to the conversion of the majority of population to·Islam. So, the Christian world not only lost its territory but also its religious following.

Under these circumstances it was interpreted that conversion took place not peacefully but by force. It suited the Christian missionaries to propagate that Islam, as a religion, had no appeal for the people and it spread not because of its appeal but because of its coercive methods. There is vast historical and

missionary literature that puts forth this image of Islam. For example William Muir's 'Life of Mahomet' and 'The Caliphate, Its Rise, Decline and Fall' pronounce his judgment that "the sword of Muhammad (PBUH), and the " Kor'an, are the most stubborn enemies of Civilization, Liberty, and the Truth, which the world has yet known." Sir Syed Ahmad Khan refuted his arguments in his famous" book Khutbat i Ahmadiya.

This image of Islam continued from medieval to the eighteenth century with ignorance and prejudice. Commenting on it Edward Said writes in 'Orientalism'; "Not for nothing did Islam come to symbolize terror, devastation, the demonic, hordes of hated barbarians. For Europe, Islam was a lasting trauma. Until the end of seventeenth century the "Ottoman peril" lurked alongside Europe to represent for the whole Christian civilization a constant danger, and in time European civilization incorporated that peril and its lore, its great events, figures, virtues, and vices as something woven into the fabric of life."

The change of this image came when European colonisation began and Muslim countries were subjugated by the European powers. The colonial administrators and politicians discovered that Muslim societies believed in 'Kismat'. It meant that every thing was pre-destined and written and could not be changed by human efforts. It indicated passivity of the Muslim societies. The British administrators and writers accused the Muslims of India believing in *kismat* and not responding to any challenge. For Example S.S. Thorburn writes about the Muslims in general and the Punjabi Muslims in particular that the fatalistic teachings were an accursed inheritance: "Mohammedanism teaches its disciples to accept every misfortune as the will of 'Allah'. It unfits him for the struggle of life."

The belief in *kismat* was the result of political and economic deterioration of the Muslim world. Defeated and subjugated and having no power to resist and fight, they took refuge in this belief. It suited the colonial powers to legitimise their power and to govern them as they liked and to administer them as they wished. This image was used as proof that there was no resistance against the colonial powers and the Muslims accepted it as the will of God.

After decolonisation when independent Muslim states emerged and a conflict ensued in these states whether to follow the secular model of Europe or the traditional Islamic structure, it divided the Muslim world into two antithetical groups. The conflict became violent as both groups tried to control state power. During the cold war period, it was the interest of the west to patronise the Islamic groups against communism; therefore, the image of Islam was not negative. Especially, after the Russian occupation of Afghanistan, the Muslims image of 'holy warrior' (Mujahid) became very popular, to the extent that President Reagan declared himself a Mujahid. During this period, special textbooks were published for Afghan pupils written by American writers in which Jihad or holy war was glorified.

The situation changed after the collapse of Russia. The Muslim mujahideen, emboldened with the idea that they had defeated Russia, could also defeat the west, launched a holy war against it. The Radical Muslim movements emerged in all Muslim countries to fight against western imperialism and western culture and civilisation. Then came September 11, which radically changed the image of Islam in the west. Radical Islam and militant Muslims have become terrorists and Islam has become a religion of violence and war. Now the challenge for the Muslim world is how to change this image and dispel the prejudice and hate which prevails in the west against it.

There are two ways to fight against an adversary: either by adopting violent methods and fighting bloody wars or by trying to convince with the help of reason the correctness of their viewpoint. Violence is a product of emotions, has no rational basis, and solves no problem. If adversary is powerful, such movements are crushed with full might. On the other hand, dialogue and reasoning create an atmosphere that helps develop the creative energies of a society and makes it intellectually mature.

Producing its own knowledge system and contributing to the civilisation of mankind, the Muslims could earn a positive image in the world. It is not an easy task but this is the only way they could remove the deep-rooted prejudices.

An Overview of Islamic Historiography

History is not a stagnant, dull and repetitive subject as it is generally assumed. On the contrary, it is a dynamic, vibrant and interesting discipline that encompasses nearly every aspect of society and gives an insight into the human mind and its psyche. History gets a new life as a result of interpretations from different points of view. Islamic history in this context like other histories also changes frequently and gives fresh perspectives about its past.

The Islamic historiography passed different stages which indicates its changing structure. In its earliest form, it was known as *Al-Ayyam*, which dealt with tribal history including tribal customs and traditions, and intertribal wars. The narrators were known as Ravi or Akhbari. In the second stage, the scope of historiography expanded as a result of conquests and conversion. To accommodate this change, the pattern of *Waqa* or *Annals* was adopted in which the important events of one year were recorded. The next stage was to write the history of 10 years entitled in a genere known as *Tabaqat*. It followed the history of dynasties such as the Umayyids, the Abbasids and later on the regional dynasties such as the Tahirids, Samanids, and Ghaznavids.

The themes of the historiography also changed according to the expansion of the Islamic state and society. The most important theme was the *Sira* or the history of the life of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). It was regarded as the ideal period of Muslim history and has been used as a model since then. It followed accounts of the early conquests, lives of great people, and the history of those countries that were conquered by the Arabs.

The periodization and name of the Islamic history changed when the Christian world made an attempt to

understand the phenomenon of the rise of Islam and its political impact. In this case they coined their own terms to describe the history of Islam. For example, they called it the history of the Saracens, which included not only Arabs but also the Turks and other ethnic Muslims. In the *Dictionary of Islam*, T.P. Hughes gives different derivations of the word. Either it was derived from *Sharq* i.e. rising sun, the east; or from *Sahara*, the desert; or from Sarah, the wife of Abraham.

The name of Moors is also given to the history of Islam, especially for those who conquered Spain. The *Dictionary of Islam* writes that the terms were derived from Mauri now known as Morocco.

There was further development in the nomenclature when a new discipline of orientalism was established in western universities. There were different motives behind it. In the earliest form, it was developed by the missionaries who were eager to understand Islam and its history in order to encounter it and to check its growth. It followed commercial and political interests that intensified after the process of colonization of the Muslim countries.

Besides, missionary, commercial and political interests, there were some genuine scholars who devoted their whole lives to study Islam and its history. The accumulative writings of all these researchers and scholars produced immense literature covering various aspects of the history of Islam. In the beginning the historians adopted the term of Mohammedan. Later on the term of Islamic history was adopted which subsequently was challenged by the European-educated Muslim intellectuals on the ground that with the political development and adoption of the institution of monarchy the structure of the state and society no longer remained Islamic.

Therefore, the Islamic history ceased after the reign of the rightly guided four caliphs. The history which followed it was the history of the Muslims and not Islam because accepting the Byzantinian and Persian institutions and traditions polluted the purity of Islam.

After the decolonization, in the 1950s and 60s, when the Arab nationalism emerged on the basis of Arabic language, it integrated the Muslims as well as the Christians in its fold.

During this period, the Islamic or Muslim history was given the new name—the history of the Arabs. The Christian Arabs especially made attempts to assert the importance of language that made them a part of the Arab nation. Philip Hitti, Albert Hourani and other Arab historians are prominent to popularize this new name.

Along with Arab nationalism, the emergence of different Arab nations, states also changed the concept of history. The Egyptians, the Syrians, and the Iraqis gave more emphasis on their territorial nationalism and traced their history from ancient times. For example, the Egyptians are proud of their ancient history of the Pharaohs, the Iraqis of their Assyrian and Sumerian civilizations. Islam becomes one of the important factors in the continuity of their national history.

In the modern historiography, when the term 'Islamic' is used, it indicates the history of the early Islam in which the Arabs played a dominant role. The history of other Muslim countries is known either on their ethnic identity, ruling dynasty and geographical location as the Ottomans, the Safavis and the Mughals. Islam is also identified culturally as the Indian, Indonesian or the North African.

During the 19th and 20th centuries, scholars all over the world took keen interest in Islam as a religion and its historical development. The old manuscripts were edited and published which provided primary sources to the historians enabling them to reconstruct the history and fill the gaps. Archaeology, anthropology and sociology further gave new tools and apparatus to understand past societies. The emergence of new knowledge removed most of the prejudices and oft-repeated myths. The result is that the history is interpreted and reinterpreted, thus given a new and fresh vision.

During colonization and after it, Muslim societies suffered as a result of economic underdevelopment and social backwardness. The domination of the western civilization and challenges to their values urged the Muslim intellectuals to respond and present their past glory to assert their identity. In the process to reconstruct the past, attempts were made to find out the "golden periods" in history. Islamic societies were projected as 'tolerant and just', where there was no discrimination against

the Christians and the Jews. The Muslims contributed to science, technology, art architecture and subsequently produced a sophisticated culture.

The knowledge system created by the Muslims inspired the Christian world and enabled them to develop their civilization. It is vehemently argued that Islam played an important part in the development of western culture.

Now, I would like to focus on some of the themes which are interpreted anew as a result of new historical evidence. One such theme is the conflict between Islam and Christianity, which is deeply rooted in both the communities. The seeds of confrontation were laid at the time when the Arabs conquered Christian countries of Syria, Iraq and Maghrib or North African, and later on Andulus. The Christians lost the land of Bible to the Muslims. They never forget it and longed to take back their lost territories.

In the 11th century, Europe was mobilized in the name of religion to launch a crusade against Islam in order to liberate the holy places of Christianity. Nearly for two centuries the crusaders dominated Al-Quds and other cities of the Arab world. In 1187, however, finally they were defeated and expelled from the occupied territories.

When in the 13th century, the Mongols emerged as a power, the Islamic world crumbled as a result of disastrous and crushing defeats. Taking advantage of this weakness, the Christian powers negotiated and established diplomatic relations with the Mongols. However, both attempts to gain politically failed to defeat the Muslim power militarily.

Keeping in view the history of the crusades, some historians point out that the establishment of the state of Israel with the help of the western power is a continuation of the crusade to weaken Islam. It is also believed that like the crusaders' political domination, the Israelis control over Palestine would come to an end after a time. In the present context, bashing of Islam by the west is also considered an age-old crusade, mentality and deep-rooted historical hostility.

The next important theme, which had created controversy in the past is conversion. For a long period it was believed that Islam was spread by the sword. Coercion and

pressure were main tools which were used by the Muslims to convert the conquered people. The modern research has dispelled the oft-repeated argument. It is proved that Islam was spread not because of force or pressure but because of social, economic and political motives, which lured people to convert voluntarily.

As Ira Lapidus points out in his book *A Study of Islamic Societies*, that upto 13th century the majority of the conquered countries of the Middle East were not Muslim. It was the slow and gradual process of conversion during which religious and social structure of the non-Muslim societies collapsed, the institution of church became weak, and landed aristocracy of Iraq and Persia were destroyed. Losing their support base actually led the conversion of people.

He also points out two patterns of conversion. If the Arabs, the Turks and the Persian Muslim elite conquered any country, they maintained its superiority and remaining a minority kept its separate identity and resisted adopting the local culture. In case, the local elite became Muslims, they integrated their cultural traditions to Islam such as it happened in Indonesia and Africa.

Historians also point out the problem which conversion created in the Islamic society. In the early period of Islam, after the conquest of Persia, when large number of Iranians became Muslims, they faced problems of integrating the Arab society. To distinguish themselves from the Arabs, they were given the status of Mawali or clients. In this capacity, they were not given equal social status which created strong resentments among the new converts. It led to a movement known as *Shaubiyya* or nationalism. To get status and integrity, they took part in all those movements which were against the status quo. Ultimately, the Abbasid Revolution fulfilled their ambitions. It was the period when the Arabs and non-Arabs integrated and became an equal part of the society.

The conflict and clash between Arab and Iranian nationalism, however, continued. From 7th to 13th centuries, Middle and North African countries were linguistically united. Arabic became their language. But Iran resisted the process of Arabicization and retained its own language, though in the form

of Arabic script. Firdusi's *Shanama* became the Bible of the Iranian nationalism and Maulana Roomi's *Mathnavi* acquired the status *Quran dar Zaba-i-Pahlavi* (Quran in the Pahlavi language). The Indian Islam is more influenced by the Iranian nationalism rather the Arabian one.

By the 14th century, the Islamic societies throughout the Islamic world are identified by three important symbols: the court (royal palace, fort), mosque, and Khanqah and Dargah (shrine). The court became the centre of political power where the monarch assumed absolute authority and ruled with the help of bureaucrats. Mosque was the seat of the Ulema who projected themselves as the defender and the interpreter of faith. Muslim rulers, throughout history successfully subordinated this influential section of society under their control by patronizing them and helping them financially. Khanqah and shrine were places where Sufi saints provided spiritual solace to the people. Mostly, they remained aloof from politics and established a parallel culture in opposition to political system. The Muslim societies circled around these three symbols.

In India, the Islamic historiography played a very important role in creating a separate Muslim identity. Unlike other Muslim societies who own the past of their countries, the Muslims of India kept themselves aloof from the Indian past and turned to the classical Islamic historical literature. Abdul Halim Sharar, Shibli Noman and Abdul Razzaq Kanpuri published in Urdu and Amir Ali in English numerous books of the history dealing with the heroes of Islam and depicting the Abbasids period and the Muslim rule in Spain as the golden periods. This tendency contributed to the two-nation theory and alienated the Muslims of India from the ancient Indian past.

History determines identity. After the partition, we are still in dilemma which identity should we accept first: Pakistani or Islamic.

Sectarianism: An Analysis

The origin and growth of sectarianism is different than communalism: It is not a clash between two religions but a clash within a religion which subsequently leads to its division and disintegration. The study of sectarianism shows that all religions in their early stage kept unity within their original structure, but with the passage of time when changes occurred in a society and social, cultural economic and political traditions, values and institutions reshaped and restructured to fulfill the changing needs, under these circumstances disruption took place in the main body of religion; and resultantly, divided a homogenous religious community into different branches. Thus, we see that at the juncture of a change, a new interpretation is required by the interested groups to use it as tools and weapons for the advantage of their material and spiritual requirements. This is how new sects come into being. Out of them, some sects have flexibility to survive all up and down of the time and others, after fulfilling their task disappear in the pages of hi story.

Therefore, a sect is a group of people who in order to fulfil their social, political, and economic needs, rebel against the established or original religion and redefine its teachings according to their needs and requirements. In the past as well as in the present a sect was/is regarded as a rebel, renegade, and traitor, which after isolating from the main body, weakened its strength and unity. Therefore sects were/are regarded hostile groups whose annihilation and destruction become the main task of the adherents of pure and original religion. Their argument is that emergence of new sects not only disrupts the continuity but disintegrates homogeneity of the main body of religion. Consequently it affects its vitality and weakens it internal structure. A crime that the followers of pure religion were/are and not ready to forgive. This conflict initiated a discussion within different religious groups whether homogeneity is a source of strength or weakness. If strength then all renegade

groups and sects should be forced to join the main body in order to keep unity. This attitude and logic justifies the policy of intolerance and persecution of renegade sects. That is why in the medieval period it was believed that to tolerate the enemies of God meant to invite His wrath which came in the shape of epidemic, famine, or earthquake. That is the reason that in Europe up to the beginning of 18th century religious tolerance was a pejorative meaning. Both Catholics and Protestants sects were proud to be intolerant to other sects.

Whenever there is sectarian clash in any society, the sect, having majority of its followers, attempts to crush or weaken the minority sect with the help of·state power. The · oppressed sect, to escape from persecution, adopts some ways and means for its survivals. Either it rebels and fights and asserts its identity; or to migrate to some other country and safe place, or to assume dissimulation and keep silence, and never dare to proclaim its beliefs openly. We have a number of instances in history following these patterns. In the Islamic history when the Kharjis, Qaramatis, and Mahdavis (followers of Mahdi Jaunpuri) attempted to put their teachings in practice, they were crushed by the state with the help of conservative and orthodox parties. The Ismailies, realizing themselves not powerful enough to challenge the state, adopted another strategy: they took refuge in the inaccessible mountain fort of Alamot and saved themselves from the wrath of state. In the recent history of USA, the Mormon sect to avoid the persecution, migrated from the main land and founded their own settlement in Lake city. The so-called discovery of America provided golden opportunity to the persecuted sects in Europe to migrate to the New World in order to observe their beliefs freely.

There is an argument in favour of creating more sects: the proponents of this argument believe that diversity is more important than homogeneity. Because orthodoxy makes religion stagnant. · The phenomenon of emergence of new sects keeps religion alive, active and makes it relevant to time. If there is no scope for new sects, the main body of religion would lose its strength and become irrelevant. Therefore, diversity in unity is essential for the life of a religion. What is required for the strength of society is sectarian tolerance.

In Christianity the emergence of the Protestant sect created intense sectarian conflict. Although there were number of sects in Christianity before, but the Protestant sect greatly weakened the Catholic Church. This conflict further intensified when the European states were also divided on the basis of their sectarian affiliations. The result was that each state persecuted the opponent sect with full religious fanaticism. In England the Catholics were not tolerated by the state and stringent laws were passed against them. Similarly, the Protestants were persecuted in France. The sectarian conflicts had devastating effects on Europe. How was France affected as a result of the sectarian clashes? L. Fisher in his book "History of Europe" writes:

"But the wars of religion very nearly broke up the hard won unity of France, inflicting evils which cannot be measured by battle losses alone. Town was divided against town, village against village, family against family. Armed affrays and assassination became incidents of ordinary life. Some murders were committed out of religious fanaticism, other in pursuit of private vengeance, others, as in all times when the hideous taint of espionage infests the body politic, out of senseless terror." The culmination of the sectarian conflict was the Bartholomew massacre of the French Protestants (24 August 1527) which shook whole France. The result of these sectarian clashes was that not finding themselves secure in France, number of talented Protestants migrated from France to different European countries which deprived her from best of her artisan and professional classes. Realizing the loss, the French government in 1598 passed the Edict of Nante which in the opinion of L. Fisher: "is notable in the history of civilization as the first public recognition of the fact that more than one religious community can be maintained in the same polity."

The Edict of Nante had far reaching effects on the political, social, and economic life of France. It provided a new energy and vitality to the French society to respond the emerging challenges and to have more politically stable society.

However, the sectarian wars continued in Europe. Germany remained a battleground of these sectarian wars from 1618 to 1648. Fisher again points out the results: "war waged with a ferocity to which history offers few parallels. It is indeed

impossible to exaggerate the miseries which the helpless peasants of German empire were compelled to endure in these iron times. There was marauding, there was starvation, there was even cannibalism. Whole villages died out, and, as is always the case in time of extreme and desperate calamity, moral restraints broke down and ceded to wild bursts of profligacy."

Europe learnt a lesson from these sectarian wars. Intolerance and hatred blocked their progress. To come out of this situation practical efforts were made to secularize the European mind and state. Subsequently, religion was separated from politics and equal rights were granted to every citizen irrespective of his religion or sect. This is how democratic and secular tradition took roots in Europe.

In the history of Islamic societies, whenever, state remained non-sectarian, no religious conflict occurred nor any sect was persecuted by the state. But when a state became sectarian, then other sects were not tolerated and persecuted. In India, the Sultans of Delhi and the Mughals remained non-sectarian and therefore followed a policy of religious toleration. The sectarian polemic remained outside the domain of the state. That is why sectarian differences did not assume worst shape. Even Aurangzeb (1658-1707) refused to dismiss his Shia Mansabdars or offices on the ground of their sectarian affiliation to the Shiite beliefs and reprimanded to those who demanded it by saying that religion and politics were two different things having no relation with each other. When his successor Shah Alam (1707-1712), who after becoming shi'a, ordered that the Shi'a khutba be read in the Friday prayer, he faced opposition. The Imam of Lahore, who complied the order of the king, was murdered by the crowd. Realizing his mistake, he withdrew his order. During the colonial period, when Islam was attacked by the colonial state, it was defended jointly by the Sunnis and Shi'as. The emergence of religious nationalism further brought both sects closer to each other.

After the independence, Shi'a—Sunni relations remained normal, except occasional riots which did not affect the deep rooted understanding of both sects. The state also acted neutral and did not adopt any sectarian agenda. However, during Zia ul Haq's period, the   attempt was made to make the state

sectarian by implementing Zakat according to the Sunni Fiqh. That became the starting point of Shi'a resistance. The interference of the state in religious matters opened Pandora's box. Questions were raised on the implementation of the shari'a: Should it be Sunni or Shi'a? The state's sectarian character encouraged different religious parties to launch a campaign in favour of their religious programme. So much so that armed gangs emerged to assert their interpretation of Islam. It followed assassination and counter assassination. The Shi'a and Sunni armed groups sought to get financial support from out side Pakistan. The results of these sectarian conflicts are that first of all, the state has lost its credibility; different sectarian factions shifted their loyalty out side of country; terrorism, after assuming religious character, justified all crimes including murder, looting and plundering opponents' properties, and insulting their past and present religious heroes.

As a result of these clashes, the sects belonging to minority group feel depressed, insecure, deprived and isolated from the mainstream. Taking advantage of the weakness of minorities, the sect belonging to majority, established its dictatorship and made attempt to capture state and use its institutions to curb and crush the hostile sects. This is what at present is going on in Pakistan. Attempts are made to make state a sectarian and use it to implement its religious agenda against the wishes of others.

The question is how to end sectarian clashes and create confidence among those sects which feel insecure. One of the methods to end sectarian clashes is to make the state neutral. Only a neutral state can give guarantee of sectarian peace. The other method to create religious toleration is to make the mind of society tolerant and secular by propagating enlightened and liberal ideas. There is a need to convince people that sects emerge out of historical necessity and compulsion, so they should be tolerated rather treated as enemies history has plenty of material to teach us how to behave towards other sects and religious minorities. We can learn lessons from the European history and also from our own traditions and culture which has enough material to make us tolerant.

French Revolution Remembered

It was 1848, the year of revolution in Europe which erupted not only in France, but also in Germany and Austria, and disturbed the ruling elites everywhere that political radicalism of the lower classes might deprive them of their power and privileges.

A German historian, Karl von Rotteck, inspired by the wave of change, remembered the French Revocation of 1789, and wrote that there were three great events that occurred in Europe: Christianity, Printing Press, and the French Revolution. Out of these three, Christianity and the printing press changed Europe and the rest of the world, gradually and silently, but the French Revolution changed everything abruptly, radically and rapidly. That is why it became the model to those who wanted to change their societies within a short span of time.

In the word of E.L. Hobsbawm; "To those who wanted to transform society, it provided an inspiration, a rhetoric and a vocabulary, a model, and a standard of comparison." Further writing on the political impact of the revolution, he observed: "A major part of the political vocabulary of all western nineteenth-century state was derived from the Revolution, and was often directly borrowed or adopted from the French."

What happened in France in 1789 made the word 'revolution' respectable. It is now customary to use this word indicating positive changes in different aspects of society and life. The interesting aspect is that different colours are associated with these revolutions to indicate their nature. For example, the Russian Revolution is Red; and the agriculture revolution becomes Green. Shah of Iran called his revolution White, signifying its peaceful nature, contrary to other revolutions that were bloody and revengeful. However in spite of the nomenclature, his reforms failed to convince the Iranian people to favour and support him. Americans, though averse to any revolution, started their war of Independence as a revolution;

perhaps to join the progressive camp and to hide their conservatism.

The Revolution of 1789 paved the way for the revolutions of 1830 and 1840 that threatened the ruling classes of Europe and forced them to think about the change in favour of the masses. They fully realized that the days of ancient regimes were over and they had to think about new changes and new setup of state structure.

This mode of thinking is indicated in the remarks of Bismarck, the German Chancellor who said, in 1866: "If there is to be a revolution, it is better that we should make it rather than to be its victims." The pressure led to the introduction of social, economic and political reforms in Europe to check the waves of revolution. It is a fact of history that the French Revolution contributed immensely to the social, economic and political life of the world, and dominated history, language and symbols. It provided an apparatus to the institution of state such as tricolour: black, red, white or blue, and national anthem on the model of Marseillaise. It provided a model of constitution having the Declaration of Rights of men, sovereignty of people, and equality before law.

The other contributions of the Revolution are: legal system, metric system, involvement of women in political activities, religious tolerance, humanitarian reforms for slaves and prisoners. Besides, it introduced the idea of people's army to defend the revolution against the invading armies. In political language, it gave the vocabulary of 'left' and 'right', indicating political leanings.

The Revolution from the very beginning tried to fulfil the dream of the downtrodden to get equal social status. Therefore, the slogan. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, showed the desire to eradicate social differences from the society. Immediately, 'Citizen' became the mode of address irrespective of the social status. It was later on followed by the Russian revolution where 'Comrade' became popular way of addressing to each other. Another significant aspect of the revolution is that like other successive revolutions, it produced no heroes. All the leading figures of the Revolution were discredited during the

process and sacrificed at the altar of Revolution. So, in the end, nobody emerged as the hero.

On the basis of this contribution and creating political consciousness through out the world, the French argue that they had sacrificed a lot to make the Revolution a success, and that, the world, therefore, should be grateful to them. However, there are different interpretations of the Revolution that highlight the radical and conservative thinking. Those who oppose the element of revolution argue that a revolution breaks traditions and removes boundaries, which works as safeguard against anarchy and disorder; it subsequently paves the way for dictatorship as it happened in France where Napoleon took power and established his authoritarian rule. Those on the other side of the fence, plead that it is essential for revolution to disconnect with the past and eliminate all past traditions. Therefore, there should be a need to set up a new system, a new structure, and use the energy of the whole society in building that new system.

A third approach is that every society is deep rooted in its past and it is not easy to uproot all connections and to start afresh. The past survives under all conditions, and remains a part of society in spite of all odds.

The experience of revolutions opens the debate among intellectuals and politicians that whether societies should be changed by revolution or by reforms. This is an important question and we have to think about it.

Partition in History

In our daily life we experience the process of partition in case of property when there is dispute among the claimants. It is customary that to settle disputes of land, building or house, the formula of partition is applied to give share of property to claimants. Partition of property therefore, is considered the last solution to solve all problems. Beyond it, concept of partition also carries the notion of purity that two parties cannot live together because of un-cleanliness which they attach with each other and find solution in separation. Further, it also means isolation from others and live in its own world without any interference.

However politically, partition conveys many aspects of political changes that a country faces as a result of political upheavals. Sometimes the two or three powerful countries partition a weak country forcibly in order to exploit its resources. That was the case of Poland that was partitioned between Prussia, Austria and Russia in 1772, 1793 and 1795 and lost its own independence. The other case is of Ireland which suffered centuries long oppression and exploitation of the British imperialism. It became independent in 1949 but Northern Ireland remains a part of the United Kingdom which subsequently perpetuates conflict between the Catholics and the Protestants. Palestine which became a mandatory territory of Britain after World War I was partitioned between the Jews and the Palestinians which led to the emergence of an independent Israeli state in 1948. The ongoing conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians is the outcome of it.

Another example is of Germany. As a result of Germany's defeat in the Second World War, it was partitioned into two: West and East Germany. Korea is another example of partitioned country as a result of war in the 1950s. A more fresh case of Cyprus, which is partitioned because of the ethnic and religious divide between Greeks and Turkish population of the

island. After ethnic riots, the Turkish army invaded the island, which led its partition and ultimately in 1983 the declaration of Independence by the Turks as the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

The latest effort of a partition is going on in Sri Lanka where Sinhalis and Tamils are fighting a bloody war that has devastated the whole country. The demand of the Tamils is for a separate homeland of their own.

In the Indian context, the then British government, following the policy of partition, divided Bengal into two provinces in order to make them administratively efficient. But the Bengali nationalists regarded it as an attempt to weaken Bengali unity and therefore started an anti-partition campaign against the government that ultimately forced the British to annul it in 1911. However, the most significant partition was of Indian subcontinent in 1947, which created two independent and sovereign states. So, there were partitions within a partition when the provinces of the Punjab and Bengal were partitioned on the basis of religion and aligned to the two new states.

After 1947, partition of Kashmir took place as a result of war between India and Pakistan, which has created a permanent discord between these two countries. In spite of wars and diplomatic efforts, the problem remains insoluble.

Keeping in view the phenomenon of partition in history, we find that mostly, countries were partitioned from the above without the consent of population on the bases of political considerations of powers involved in it. As a result, partition led to catastrophe. Common people suffered heavily. There was transfer of population, loss of property, parting of families, and in case of riots, loss of human lives. Those who were forced to leave their ancestral homeland never compromised with the new situation. Memories of the past haunted them for their whole lives. Broken families lost their support base and emotionally became weaker and weaker, unable to make new friends and adjust in the new environments. The first migrant generation became the lost generation in the wilderness of their new home.

Moreover in case of partition, the boundaries are never fixed to the satisfaction of parties and resulted in clashes and conflicts. We have the examples of Palestine, Ireland, Cyprus

and India Pakistan. These countries are still fighting on the question of boundaries. In case of India and Pakistan, the Boundary. Commission announced its decision after Independence leaving no chance to challenge it. It is also evident from history that once a country is partitioned, it becomes difficult to reunite it. Poland was reunited after various partitions because its population kept its identity alive and resisted against the occupation of the big powers. Germany, after partition spent nearly four decades living in two different ideologies. When it was reunited in 1989, it brought lot of problems to bring together people of two wings. Though the country was united but it was difficult to reunify people.

Evidence shows that partition is a painful process because it reconstructs political and social structures, reshapes geography and disrupts continuity of history. We see that how after the partition, newly independent states reinvent their own version of history. We also notice that how both partitioned societies suffer intellectually and culturally because of the displacement of scholars, artists, musicians and intellectuals. In some cases, roots of hostility are so deep rooted that efforts to reconcile with the reality become impossible and two past partners live in perpetual animosity. However, it is also clear that sometime partition becomes the only solution to give security and protection to ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities that are persecuted by majority of a united country.

Weapons of the Weak

Whenever there is injustice and exploitation in any society, there is also response from the exploited and weaker section of society. Sometime, the expression of resistance is silent and suppressed, and sometime it is open and violent. Historians point out that how common people have used their power and energy against their oppressors. If they felt that they were not strong enough to rebel and fight, they wisely resorted to silent resistance and innovate such methods that baffled their overlords.

For example, in slave and feudal systems, where slaves and peasants were not powerful to challenge their masters, they adopted protracted but effective methods of resistance such as stealing, damaging or setting fire to property, feigning ignorance, breaking tools, lying, and delaying to complete the assigned task.

These modes of resistance, suggest that how the weak might outwit, deceive, or manipulate the strong. These examples also show that human beings, in spite of the use of power and coercive methods, could not submit and fight for their survival by changing their tactics.

In a slave society, besides adopting usual modes of resistance, slave used flight from plantation as a means to protest against exploitation and get freedom at the risk of his life. Though it was an act of individual defiance or resistance, there were occasionally group escapes that challenged the very existence of the system. These runaway slaves formed 'marooned communities' to be away from the domain of law which was oppressive to them.

The community life provided them protection. On the attitude of slaves to resist, Lee Rose writes in *Freedom and Slavery* that, "There is certain kind of strength that goes with weakness, and a certain weakness that goes with strength. The slaves who learned to exploit these techniques for survival on the precarious raft of another man's good will has been called

"sambo", an inglorious sobriquet indeed, with cowardly connotations. But it is presumptuous in posterity to dismiss contemptuously the methods that enabled generations of slaves to endure their harsh lot of life, and to snatch from it a few human satisfactions."

We also find this silent resistance in the factory and domestic workers that is mostly attributed to their base and mean character. There is an interesting advice that a father gives to his children: "I tell them (the youngsters) 'Remember, you're selling your labour and the one who buys it wants to see that he gets something for it, so work when he's around, then you can relax when he goes away, but make sure you always look like you're working when the inspectors are there".

The main features of silent resistance are that it is not organized, it neither have any leader, nor is it started with any plan, nor it used to has any manifesto, banners or party name, therefore, it generally goes unnoticed and nothing appears sensational in media about it.

Commenting on the attitude of historians and social scientists on silent resistance, James C. Scot writes in his book *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Form of Peasant Resistant* that "History and social science, because they are written by the intelligentsia using written records that are also created largely by literate officials, is simply not well-equipped to uncover the silent and anonymous forms of class struggles that typify the peasantry."

On the other hand, open and armed rebellions of slaves and peasants were brutally crushed. They were dubbed as enemies of empire or community. They were dehumanized and tortured after their defeat. We have seen that how the famous slave rebellion of Spartacus was crushed by the Roman Empire and all rebels were crucified.

In America, the slave rebellion of South Carolina in 1739, and Nat Turner's rebellion in Southampton Country Virginia in 1831 were mercilessly crushed. It happened to the peasant rebellions in Europe, China, and India.

No doubt these rebellions indicated the deep anger and mistrust and used open rebellion as the last resort but they failed

to change the system and ended in sacrificing their lives for the cause.

As court and .official historians wrote history, these rebellions are not treated sympathetically but condemned as creating chaos and disintegration in society. Keeping in view this aspect of rebellion, Marc. Bloch, a French historian, writes: "Almost invariably doomed to defeat and eventual, massacre, the great insurrections were altogether too disorganized to achieve any lasting result. The patient, silent struggle stubbornly carried on by rural communities over years would accomplish more than flashes in the pan."

Silent resistance and open rebellions show that individual, as well as, groups and communities want to have dignity and honour. If any system fails to provide this, unsatisfied elements make continuous and persistence efforts to subvert it.

For the privileged and ruling classes, it takes time to understand the feelings and anger of the subordinate classes. The result is that change comes at a high cost.

Merry-Making in History

Festivities and merry-making were allowed by all pagan cults and religions which encouraged man to express his sentiments openly and enjoy life without inhibition. The Semitic religions, however, changed the whole concept of pleasure and merry-making by laying down the dos and don'ts

The concept of pleasure and merry-making have undergone a change in history but in spite of the vicissitudes of change remain an essential part in the life of an individual and society. Man, throughout history has indulged in pleasure and merry-making by singing, dancing, gambling, feasting, and playing different games. The occasions were festivals, ceremonies, and social gatherings.

The seasonal festivals became so important in every society that despite social and religious changes, they continued to be celebrated with the same vigour and enthusiasm as before. Christmas is one of the examples. It was shifted from January 6, to December 25, because the newly converted Christians continued to celebrate it as the birthday of the sun. The Christian Fathers resolved to incorporate it and celebrate it as Christ's birthday. In ancient Greece and Rome, besides religious and cultural festivals, banquets were held to celebrate birth, marriage, recovery from sickness and victory against an enemy. The usual pattern of the banquet was that early in the dinner people ate without drinking. Later they drank without eating. Between dishes there was music with dancing and singing by professional musicians hired for the occasion. Drinking meant the pleasure of good company culture, and in some cases the charm of friendship.

In India, there are different festivals which are celebrated regularly and provide opportunity to everyone to enjoy. The festival of Holi, the spring festival is held at the approach of the

vernal equinox in honour of god Krishna. One of the features of the festival is the fastening of Rakhi.

The festival of Diwaj (a row of lamps) is celebrated on the day of the new moon. At this festival, the Hindus, after bathing in some river, put on their best dresses. At night they worship Lakshami, the goddess of gold: houses and streets are illuminated and night is spent in gambling. On the festival of Dausehra (the taken away ten sins) whoever bathes in the Ganges is said to be purified from ten sorts of sins. The Nauroz is the spring festival which is celebrated in Iran.

In the Achaemenid time the official year began with Nauroz. The Sassanide rulers celebrated it with public festivities. During the Abbasid period, it was introduced at the court with other Persian festivals. The Mughal rulers celebrated it for seven days with great merry-making: in the royal Naubatkhana kettledrum were beaten, while the singers sang charming songs and the musicians entertained with their melodies. Towers, minarets and all other points of the royal palace were illuminated with colourful light which shinning through coloured shades, looked like a field full of flowers. Green flags and banners were hoisted to indicate the advent of spring. All houses were bedecked in embroidered silken cloths of different colours. A procession of army passed through the streets. Soldiers were dressed in coloured uniforms bearing glittering swords, shields, bows and arrows.

A fancy bazaar was the interesting part of Nauroz celebrating: stalls were distributed among different nobles who erected beautiful tents and displayed interesting articles for the inspection of the emperor. A fancy bazaar was also held for the royal ladies, which was called Mina bazaar. All the shopkeepers in this bazaar were ladies of high ranks.

Festivities and merry-making were allowed by all pagan cults and religions which encouraged man to express his sentiments openly and enjoy life without inhibition. The Semitic religions, however, changed the whole concept of pleasure and merry-making by laying down the dos and don'ts. This world became a temporary resort for man where he should abstain from all pleasure and observe asceticism in order to get reward in the life hereafter. It made life barren, dull and charmless. But the

instinct of merry-making is so strong that man rebels against all these taboos and restrictions and finds his way to get pleasure to enjoy life.

New Millennium! So What?

Much hype and enthusiasm have surrounded the end of the second millennium and the start of the third. There would be few, if any, who might have steered clear of the zany path, but generally the sentiment has echoed far and wide. In this mad rush for celebrations, many among us have failed to realize that this is one more of those occasions which go to show the domination of Western culture and thought and the deep and wide influence of its concepts and ideas on us.

There is also an element of commercialism in all the hoopla heralding the arrival of the New Age. A series of new books on the subject have hit the shelves worldwide; print and electronic media have been selecting prominent and history-making personalities; historians are analysing the history of the personalities; projecting the positives and conveniently forgetting the negatives, and so on. Progress has been the central idea of the media focus. This suits the Western civilization.

On the part of the masses, they are never to lose an opportunity to celebrate. Gusto and gaiety mark the Western life, but what we, in the Third World, have got to do with such millennium symbolism is beyond comprehension.

The millennium, in the first place, is according to the Christian calendar, which was introduced, after corrections and amendments, by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582. There are a number of other calendars originating from different civilizations dividing time according to their concepts, and interpreting it according to their ideas. Does the translation from one millennium to the other of the followers of any other calendar comes anywhere close to what we are witnessing in relation to the Christian millennium?

In every civilization, the concept of time varies. To some there is continuity, while to the others there is a "discontinuity of time". Rejecting both the concepts, however, Greek philosopher Lucretious remarked that, "time a is nothing

in itself", meaning that there are people who devise it, mould it, and interpret it according to their needs and requirements. That is why there are cyclic and linear views of time.

The cyclic concept dominated nearly all ancient civilizations like the ones in Greece and India where wheel symbolized its passage. As time went by, scientists and scholars influenced by astrology and astronomy tended to favour the cyclic concept, while the linear concept was brought into play by the merchant class and the increasing influence of money on daily life. The cyclic concept suited the landed economy where time was plenty and associated with an unchanging cycle of soil. On the other hand, with the circulation of money emerged the concept of mobility and the idea of progress.

However, believing in the continuity of time, ancient sages realized that it was difficult to understand the past, and, therefore, they divided time into different 'ages' and 'periods'. Once it was done, it became easy for historians, archeologists and scholars of other hues to analyse history and the effects of change in the process of history.

To understand change within a framework of some age or period is, indeed, a difficult task. Historically, the process of change is very slow and sometimes goes unnoticed by the contemporaries. It crosses boundaries of an 'age' or 'period'. Though results are often drawn now with the help of survey and data collection, any concrete and solid assessment is only possible after the passage of time; considerable time, indeed.

In most of the ancient civilizations, the concept of millennium was associated with the Golden Age phenomenon. An age in the distant past when there, supposedly, was peace and prosperity. When there was no war and no conflicts. When there was plenty of food and plenty of land. And, hence, the desire to get back what had been lost.

The ancient Greeks were in favour of the cyclic concept of time. According to Heraclitus, the duration of the dying Old Age and the coming new one is 10,800 years. Another Greek source assessed that the duration was 18,000 years. in the Indian civilization, the golden period is known as 'satya', or 'the age of truth'. Then comes 'kaliyug', or 'the Dark Age' which is symbolized by disorder and anarchy. However, according to

Hindu beliefs, the world would not live in the Dark Age forever and a saviour would come to change the conditions and revolve the cycle back to the Golden Age. In Judeo-Christian and Islamic traditions, however, the coming of the New Age is linear, and not cyclic. According to Christianity, the Christ will return to the world along with resurrected saints, and after eliminating all the evils he will reign over a golden kingdom.

In Western history, the concept of millennium has played a very important role. Whenever oppressed by the ruling classes, the masses would await the arrival of the New Age, hoping that it would protect them against excesses or would inspire them in some way to rise up in revolt against the authorities. The Jacquarie revolt of 1358, and the peasants' revolt of 1381 were the results of this concept. It was believed that with the advent of the New Age the world would have been freed of avarice, inequality and injustice. Some modern scholars believe that the advancement of science and technology in the 20th century has been a preparation for the millennial utopia.

The concept of millennium is also present in Islamic traditions, based, naturally, on the Hijra calendar. There is a hadith to the effect that a mujaddad, or the Renovator, would come after a thousand years to reinvigorate and give a new life to the religion. During the closing years of the sixteenth Christian century, when the first millennium of the Hijra era was coming to an end, it was believed that the time of the coming of the mujaddad had arrived. There was much excitement in the court of Emperor Akbar. It was at this time when Akbar had started religious debates at his Ibadat Khana, and the failure of the ulema to respond effectively to the questions which he raised, had created doubts in his mind regarding the religion itself.

It was under these circumstances that Akbar's idea of a new religion emerged, based on the supposed need of a Renovator. Some courtiers suggested that the long awaited Renovator was no other than the emperor himself. As there has been no dearth of flatterers and sycophants during any age in history, there were many among the ulema who declared Akbar as the Lord of the Age, the Perfect Man and so on.

People were made to believe that a new age had begun and, accordingly, everything should be reconstructed and

reshaped. Akbar ordered that a history of thousand years be written, and some volumes were compiled and written by a board of historians under the title of Tarikh-i-Alfi. It was also believed that the Hijra era bad became obsolete, and, therefore, a new era was ushered in—Deen-e-Ilahi, as it was called—commencing from the first of Nauroz, the spring festival of the Persian calendar.

Reacting to the sacrilegious innovation, orthodox circles reconstructed their own history and the title of Mujaddad Alf-e-Sani was bestowed on Ahmad Sirhindi by his followers, claiming that he had resisted the innovations of Akbar, and had saved the religion from destruction.

In this modern age of Western culture and globalization, we have adopted the Gregorian calendar. We use it in our daily lives, and have adjusted our history within its framework, leaving the Hijra calendar out in the cold, using it just to determine religious festivals. The millennium-related celebration, as such, is only a manifestation of our mindless approach.

The vital question, however, is: what exactly are we celebrating? What have we achieved in the last thousand years? And, are we ready to face the new challenges ahead? We have seen that after the first Hijra millennium, nothing significant has taken place in the Muslim world. It has faced decline and disintegration every where. The Safavids, the Mughal and the Ottoman, the last three great Muslim powers, disappeared from the map of the world. We, in the sub-continent, experienced colonization and gained precious little from our independence. There is every likelihood that the new millennium may not change our society, decadent and corrupt that it is, because the destiny of nations is not something that based on timeframes. Much to the contrary, people change times. Can we do this? Any doubts in this regard may not be entirely misplaced.

The Way They Lived

Conflict between the old and the new has been a fact of life since times immemorial. This struggle between the established order and the emerging ideas and values has invariably resulted in the defeat of the first. Change is inevitable and society should be ready for it. Yet in generation after generation the same story of a tussle between the two repeats itself.

Why should that be? According to the Concise Oxford Dictionary, lifestyle is "a particular way of life of a person or group". This is invariably the product of innovation, creativity, taste and resources of a group of individuals that wants to distinguish itself from others and have a separate identity of its own. To be different from others is the driving force of lifestyle. That is why lifestyle never remains static. It changes from time to time to reflect the group's individuality and a sense of being distinct. Change is known to cause conflict.

The lifestyle of a group which exercises influence over public opinion tends to become an ideal and a model for society to emulate. But sometimes the standard set might be so high or so expensive that it becomes difficult for other groups to reach it. That is how economic class tends to have a bearing on lifestyle.

When we speak of lifestyle, it covers most aspects of daily life from dress, food, home and etiquette to sports, games, and language. People are identified by their lifestyle and their status in society is also determined by that. Lifestyle is also closely related to economic classes. The rich and wealthy change their lifestyle frequently because they have the resources to do that. They can also invest more in fashion which makes their living glamorous and glittering.

On the other hand, the lifestyle of the common people remains unchanged over a longer span of time, unless economic development and the process of democratization provide them access to modern amenities. However, in every society groups

emerge from time to time that challenge the high standards of the elite classes and set their own lifestyle in sheer defiance. The Banka of Lucknow were a case in point. They evolved their own lifestyle which was distinct from the mainstream and defied all the normal practices and traditions in vogue in the Lukhnawi culture. Such was the impact of the Banka lifestyle that it became proverbial in North India. Abdul Halim Sharar gives a vivid account of the Bankas in his book *Guzishta Lucknow ke tammuddani jalwe* (Cultural glimpses of the bygone Lucknow). The other example is that of the punks in Europe of the seventies who defied the elite culture of western society and gained immense popularity among the youth because of their rebellious nature.

Historically, we find that in India the lifestyle of individuals and groups changed as a result of political, social, cultural, and economic factors. In the mediaeval period, the Turks and the Mughals (ethnically they were also Turks) brought quite a distinct lifestyle to India. The nobility maintained its Central Asian and Persian lifestyle in their early period but slowly the local culture and the impact of climate led them to mould their lifestyle to the new environment.

The nobility and the ruling classes with their affluence and political power sought to display their wealth and authority through their lavish lifestyle in order to gain respect in society. Their ostentatious living style was reflected in the huge palatial houses which were built on the river banks having gardens, halls, rooms, and separate quarters for the harem. K. M. Ashraf gives details of such palaces in his book *Life and condition of the people of Hindustan*: "The palace walls were decorated with silk hangings and velvet tapestries fringed with brocade and worked with precious stones. The usual articles of decoration were arms and weapons with gold, ebony and damascened work, candle-sticks, candle-bras, carpets, ewers, scent boxes, writing cases, chess boards, bookcases and covers."

Conscious of its status, the nobility gave particular attention to its dress. Fashion and couture indicated not only the social status of an individual but also reflected his taste. To obtain unique and innovative dresses for themselves the ruling elite patronized the artisan class that acquired the expertise in

producing the finest clothes in the world. The dress was made of thin material interwoven with golden threads and decorated with an embroidered pattern of flowers and foliage. Costly diamonds, pearls, rubies, and precious stones were stitched on to different pieces of costumes. Sometimes ordinary people were ordered not to wear the dress which was for the nobility. Akbar introduced a system whereby certain kinds of dresses were to be worn only by persons of different ranks. Generally, common people were not allowed to carry arms. It was the privilege of the nobility only.

Food was also a key item in the lifestyle of the mediaeval nobility of India. One of the largest establishments within the palace of a high ranking person was the *matbakh khana* or the kitchen. It was divided into various departments for the preparation of different articles of food, e.g. the *rikab khana* (pantry), *abdar khana* (for water), *mewa khana* (for fruits), *sherbet khana* (for beverages), *tambal khana* (for betel) and *aftabchi khana* (for ewer). The noble did not eat alone. He always enjoyed his food in the company of friends or family. Dishes were also sent as gifts to friends. The poor and needy people were also provided food as a show of generosity of the nobles. The kitchen was the status symbol of a noble and the measure of his generosity was the number of people who dined from his kitchen.

In matters of manners and etiquette, the elite classes consciously took care to behave according to their social status. There were different modes of respect in the hierarchical society. It was the custom that when the elite classes met each other, they observed equality in manners and etiquette. They would embrace each other, sit side by side on the carpet and speak politely. But once they addressed the lower classes, their attitude would change from politeness to arrogance. They addressed them with contempt and used harsh language. Poor people countered this high mindedness with flattery to protect themselves from the wrath and bad temper of their patron.

The Mughal nobility maintained a high living standard as long as there was political stability and peace, and they had plenty of resources at their disposal. The situation changed with the fragmentation of the Empire and the weakness of political

power. By the eighteenth century, their lifestyle came to be badly eroded and it became difficult for them to maintain their class characteristics.

In such a situation a new genre of literature emerged to provide them guidance on how to preserve their dignity and class character in society. This was known as 'Mirzanama' in which the 'Ashraf' (elite) were instructed how to dress, eat, and behave in public and keep their status high above others.

For example, it was advised "When talking, he should not speak at length; he should be brief and concise. If someone also speaks to him at length, and he has to listen to him, then he should only outwardly be attentive, but inwardly occupy his mind with something better, not to let time be wasted. He should always provide perfumes in his parties to keep his party fragrant with them. All sorts of vases full of flowers in every season should be on view. Without them, he should consider the luxury of living as forbidden. He should form the habit of eating with the tips of his fingers. He should stop eating before he is full; even though he remains hungry; for it is not easy to be a Mirza. He should not eat outside the dining room; for eating outside it like eating at the shop in the bazaar. Of all means of riding, he should regard a palki (palanquin) as the best." (English translation by Aziz Ahmad)

With the political ascendancy of the British, the lifestyle of the Indians came into conflict with the western culture that became a sign of progress and prestige. Sir Saiyed tried his best to modernize the Muslim Ashraf (Nobility) and prepare them mentally to accept the new cultural and social trends. His magazine *Tahzib al-Akhlaq* was an attempt to accelerate the process of modernization. He himself adopted the European lifestyle. When Mohsin al-Mulk met him for the first time and saw him in three-piece suit eating with a fork and a knife on the dining table he was shocked. Sir Saiyed convinced him and exhorted him not to hesitate to adopt the new lifestyle.

Slowly and gradually, the European lifestyle became a fashion among the feudal classes. After 1857, the new generation of the landlords fully adopted it. A British officer observed that as a result of modern education, the class of landlords changed its lifestyle and no longer remained

uncultured and rustic. They transformed themselves and came to resemble the English feudal lords, wore European dress, entertained their guests with champagne and cigars, and showed the photo album of their family to their European guests without any hesitation.

Both Indian and European lifestyles continued parallel up to the beginning of the twentieth century. Josh Maleehabadi vividly narrates the contrast of both in his memoirs. He points out that there were three groups having different lifestyles: one was purely eastern, insisting on maintaining the old traditions and their own way of life. They were against any change in their lifestyle or cultural values. The second group was semi-eastern and semi-western, while the third group was completely immersed in the western culture and adopted modern lifestyle. According to Josh, the eastern values and norms dominated the cultural life, but the intense on-going conflict between the forces of continuity and modernity ultimately resulted in the disappearance of the traditional lifestyle and acceptance of the European way of life by the elite and the middle classes.

This brief sketch of the history of lifestyle shows that lifestyle has never been monolith but has varied from class to class and changed according to the needs and desires of groups or individuals.

Art From Darbar to V Bazaar

The Mughal emperors, like many medieval rulers in Asia and Europe, sought ways and means to promote their image and to show off their wealth and glory. To achieve this they employed historians to record their achievements. Likewise, poets were employed to compose poetry in their praise; musicians, to entertain and refresh them; architects, to build forts, palaces and tombs that would exhibit their splendour; and artists, to immortalize them by painting their portraits, important occurrences of their reign and episodes from their lives.

To make the darbar look like a centre of culture and refined taste, they invited the best and excellent musicians, architects and artists and patronized them by lavishly rewarding them and bestowing high titles upon them. In the medieval period, artists and other professionals had to rely on patronage of those who had the resources and material means.

The result of this reliance was that the artists' art and creativity depended on their patron. They had to work on the commissioned tasks and found little space for their own expression. Therefore, this type of art that came from top down and not as an expression of an artist's inner conviction or thought, had no or little relation with society and people. It fulfilled the motives and interests of the upper and elite classes only.

Babur and Humayun both had keen interest in painting but did not get much time to promote it. Akbar, who organized the department of painting and employed a number of artists to work in it, completed what had remained unaccomplished by his ancestors. The result of his efforts was that soon a team of artists was trained to work on the jobs commissioned by the emperor.

Interestingly, most of these artists were young Hindus who were trained by Iranian masters and subsequently became accomplished artists themselves. Abul Fazl, writing in *Aa'in-i-Akbari* about this department, comments: "Hence the arts

flourish and many painters have attained great reputation. The work of all the painters is laid before his majesty, the emperor, on a weekly basis by the *daroghas* and clerks; he then rewards according to excellence of workmanship."

Akbar, like his Turkish and Iranian counterparts, did not pay much attention to the taboo of drawing human figures, as was held to be the case by the religious puritans. However, Abul Fazl still needed to justify the emperor's position in *Aa'in-i-Akbari*: "I have to notice that the observing of the figures and objects and making of likeness of them, which are often looked upon as an idle occupation, are, for a well regulated mind, a source of wisdom, and an antidote against the poison of ignorance. Bigoted followers of the letter of the law are hostile to the art of painting; but their eyes now see the truth."

The development of painting at the Mughal court leads us to identify some specific trends. For example, first of all, we find that the Mughal emperors were very conscious of history and proud of their ancestry. Therefore, artists were commissioned to illustrate history books dealing with their family. These included *Changeznama, Zafarnama, Timurnama* and Baburnama. The illustrations in these books linked the emperor with the past and confirmed the continuity of his dynasty's rule.

The Mughals were proud of their relationship with Changez Khan and claimed to rule India on the basis of its conquest by Timur. Both Akbar and Jahangir were also conscious that their rule should find a dignified place in history alongside their ancestors. These feelings are fully reflected in *Akbarnama* and *Tuzzul-i-Jahangiri*, both of which include miniature paintings commissioned by the two emperors and drawn by their court painters. An attempt was made not only to preserve history in a written form but also construct it in illustrations to make it more lively and colourful, as was also the case in medieval Persia.

This sense of continued grandeur is fully reflected in one painting titled *Shahan-i-Timuriya* (the Timurid Kings) in which Babur, Humayun, and Akbar are shown together enjoying the pleasant atmosphere of a garden. Later on, Jahangir and

Shahjahan added their portraits and joined the company of their illustrious ancestors.

Also, the Mughals were interested in keeping their links with the sophisticated Persian culture and arts. Masterpieces of classical Persian literature, such as *Khamsa* and *Baharistan* of *Jami*, *Dastan-i-AmirHamza*, *Haft Paikar*, and *Kalila wa Damna*, were illustrated to set standards for, and to inspire, the younger court artists. The Mughals were also fond of the classical Hindu literature that was translated from Sanskrit into Persian. The epics of *Ramayan* and *Mahabharata* (*Razmnama*) were illustrated. These illustrations synthesized three cultures: the Mongol, Persian and Indian, and integrated them into a new emerging culture which came to be known as the Mughal culture. Hence the latter came to be known as a culture of tolerance and enlightenment.

The other important aspect of the Mughal painting is that it represents important historical as well as social and cultural events with full life and passion, as in the works depicting scenes from festivals, hunting expeditions, royal processions, elephant fights, weighing ceremony, reception of ambassadors at the court, scenes of regular holding of court and its etiquette. Jahangir kept a team of artists with him and whatever he found interesting, asked them to paint it on the spot. The result is that there are paintings of birds, animals, flowers, trees, beggars, singers and saints that have come down to us and that give immense information about the environment, ornithology and lifestyle of the people during the Mughal era.

Generally, the Mughal emperors were fond of being painted in the company of the nobility and servants. In most of the paintings, they are depicted as being surrounded by courtiers. But they were also interested in getting their individual portraits drawn. Jahangir was so fond of his portraits that he used to award these to his favourites as gifts, to be displayed on their turbans. The Mughal nobles, following this practice, commissioned the artists to draw their portraits in their royal robes and regalia along with the weapons that they carried. As a result of this interest, we have today the portraits of leading Mughal nobles that help us understand their role in history. The

treasure of the Mughal paintings is a great primary source for historians to write social and cultural history of that period.

The art of painting, however, began to decline as Shahjahan succeeded Jahangir. He was more interested in architecture as opposed to painting. However, one of the positive results of this was that the art of painting, which had been confined to the darbar, now came out of it. Artists began to wander from one place to another in search of a patron. Some of them migrated to the Deccan, where they were well received by the rulers of Bijapur, Golkanda, and Bihar? In the 18th century, when the Mughal dynasty 'declined, the artists in search of livelihood went to the courts of Oudh and the Nizam of Hyderabad.

Some of them found lesser patrons in small towns, who helped promote the '*qasba culture*', which made small towns culturally rich and distinguished. Those who were not lucky to find patrons established their shops in the bazaars. This was an important change. Thus, the artists, after losing their royal patrons, turned to society for support. As bazaar artists, they performed two tasks: First, they copied the paintings of old masters and sold them to those who would buy them; and second, they began to make portraits of anyone who would pay them for doing so.

Still, these bazaar artists kept their skill and excellence, as reported by the French traveller Bernier, who visited India during Shahjahan's reign: "I have often admired the beauty, softness, and delicacy of their paintings and miniatures, and was particularly awed by the exploits of Akbar painted on a shield by a celebrated artist, who was said to have taken seven years in completing the painting." The tradition of the bazaar artists continued up to the last days of the Mughal rule. People of Delhi found them at the Chandni Chowk, where they were seen sitting with their brushes and colour ready to draw a portrait of their clients. They also kept paintings on the themes of classical stories or natural scenes according to the taste of the people. Their paintings decorated the homes of those who were not part of the nobility but were simply able to buy these from the bazaar artists. Thus, even though the art came from the court, it eventually reached the ordinary people.

As for the development of the Mughal art, many an art critic says that the art reached its excellence and stayed its level as long as the rulers or the nobility patronized it. Once this patronization came to an end and artists had to rely on society, the art declined. Consequently, the art of painting, by and large, became cheap and vulgar. It lost its excellence and refinement.

This raises another very pertinent question: Do we need a darbar for the promotion of art and culture? Or, alternatively, can we try to build an educated and cultured society that will patronize and promote the arts?

Silenced by History

History records deeds and acts of those who wield power. Rest are marginalised or ignored which leaves spots of silence in history. History is also silent about those who challenge, rebel, and fight against establishment.

Take the example of the slaves in ancient Greek who undertook all the menial work and spared the elite and ruling classes to think and produce philosophy and works of art. History fails to recognise their services and glorifies Greek thinkers and politicians. Same is the case of the builders of pyramids. They were ordinary workers and slaves who produced the wonder of the world but their services are not recorded and they disappeared in oblivion of history.

Thus what we read is incomplete history and obviously draw faulty conclusions from it. Our historical consciousness remains one-sided. Subsequently, we fail to understand the whole process of history and its complications.

However, there is a new genre of history known as 'history from below' and historians of this school are trying to retrieve the forgotten history and rehabilitate those who are ignored and neglected. In the process, they are discovering the history of peasants, pastoral people, nomads, and workers and highlight their contribution to social change.

There have always been conscious efforts to keep history silent on all those aspects that are not liked by the power elite. Their exploitation, corruption, misrule, mal-administration, intrigues and conspiracies are omitted from the pages of history, leaving no evidence. For example, colonial powers did not record movements of resistance against them in order to keep their benevolent and enlightened image. In the Indian uprising of 1857, the British point of view was projected—there is silence in history regarding the torture, hanging, demolishing of houses and mistreating of Indians. The only voice was the voice of the British.

Worker's strikes, peasant rebellions, and cruelties of officials against common people during the colonial period do not figure anywhere. The colonial rule left no record of their oppression and exploitation. That is why the old generation still remembers good old days of the British Raj.

However, the irony is that the same policy of selective history is followed both in India and Pakistan to narrate the 'struggle for freedom' in terms of.the Congress and the Muslim League's achievements. The credit for independence is taken by these parties, under the claim that there were not other parties or groups that struggled against colonialism. In the general history books, there is no mention of Ghadar party, the sacrifices and hardship that its members endured. There is no record of Bhagat Singh and his friends who died for a sacred cause and infused fresh energy in the freedom movement. They still wait to get a rightful place in history and among the freedom fighters.

In Pakistani historiography, nationalist Muslims are the most hated people. There is no mention of Hakim Ajmal, Dr. Ansari, Zakir Hussain, and others. Nor those regional leaders who were not with the League such as Fazle Hussain, Sikander Hiyat, Khizr Tawana of the Punjab and Fazl Haq of Bengal. G.M. Syed is no more a part of national history but posed in the arena of provincial history of Sindh only because he opposed the league. Ghaffar Khan of NWFP is also treated in the same manner and ousted from national history.

In the recent history of Pakistan, the policy of silence pervades the events and individuals that are not liked by the ruling classes. History does not tell what happened in Bangladesh and who was responsible for human rights violation and killing of civilians. The much applauded Hamoodur Rahman commission's Report is silent on a number of points. It fails to pinpoint those who were involved in the massacre of Dhaka University professors. For the people of Pakistan, nothing wrong happened in East Pakistan, so there is no justification for any apology.

Very few people who know about the insurgency in Balochistan and its causes during Z.A. Bhutto's period. Nor is the MRD movement during Zia's rule fully recorded. There is

no record of those workers and activists who were tortured in the
. Fort and spent the best part of their lives in jails.

. The consequence of this truncated history is that our
minds and consciousness is shaped by it. If we read the history
of only conquests and wars, we glorify conquerors and victors.
We worship power and authority. On the other hand if we read
history of philosophers, thinkers, and poets and artists, their
ideas and thoughts stimulate us to think and to challenge out-
dated ideas and institutions.

Therefore, it is very important to reconstruct our past on
quite different lines. Instead of writing profusely on rulers and
kings we must highlight the contribution of men of letters. In
case of the medieval history of India we know the names of all
ruling dynasties but we do not know much about, Abul Fazl and
Fadlullah Shirazi, two giant intellectuals of the Mughal period.
There is a need to rewrite the history from the below and
reconstruct past which could guide us today.

Colonization of Knowledge

If any society loses its knowledge system and depends on others for guidance, inspiration and understanding of its socio-economic and political problems, it is worse than being subjected to political or economic control by a foreign power. In the case of political colonization, the society that is subjugated retains its identity and power of resistance to fight and struggle against economic exploitation and political subordination. But in the case of intellectual domination, it loses not only its dignity, honour and self-respect, but it also has to endure humiliation and insult. As a result of it, the people are robbed of their creativity and innovation.

The Pakistani society is a case in point. After independence, we have experienced political subjugation and economic exploitation by our own ruling classes and have also faced intellectual decline. Our educational and academic institutions have failed to produce any new research in any field of knowledge. The result is that we depend entirely on the works of others and seek their help whenever we are faced with a crisis and need help in crime investigation or tracing the causes of accidents. We depend on foreign experts to draw up our economic plans, to recommend education reforms, and to control the law and order situation. In some cases they also tell us how to govern ourselves and how to administer our financial system.

Leaving aside other areas of dependency, I have only two disciplines in my mind: history and archaeology which have suffered heavily as a result of intellectual dependence. Here I would like to discuss the consequences of the deterioration in their standards and its impact on society.

Is it not an irony that just after independence when the question of writing the biography of Muhammad Ali Jinnah arose, we failed to find a historian amidst us and asked a British historian, Hector Bolitho, to pen down the biography of the father of the nation? We did not realize that a person with no

genuine interest in the leader of the nation who undertook the project only for pecuniary reasons could not write a biography. The work was done hurriedly. He wrote an eulogical biography to please those who invited him and left after getting his payment. It remains a sub-standard book and enjoys no standing in the academic world.

The government of Pakistan set up the Quaid-i-Azam Academy with the purpose of producing research on his life and works. One of its directors published a biography of Jinnah during the Ziaul Haq period and interpreting Jinnah's speech of August 11, 1947 wrote that the speech was delivered when the Quaid was a sick man. Moreover, not being well versed in Islamic mores and traditions, he could not speak otherwise.

He was reprimanded for this interpretation and was asked to withdraw these sentences that he duly did. He also published Fatima Jinnah's book on Jinnah titled *My brother* and admitted that he had deleted some sentences from it, which were, perhaps, not to the liking of the rulers in office then. One can imagine the standard of such research. How could it be accepted as serious scholarly work? The result was that an America historian, Stanley Wolpert, wrote a biography from his own perspective. It has a number of historical and factual mistakes but it became very popular in Pakistan.

Now, he is regarded as an expert on Jinnah. We invite him to speak about our Great leader. Once Gail Minault, an American historian, had visited Lahore. She was invited to speak on Rashidul Khairi, a famous Urdu writer. There were young girls and boys who very enthusiastically attended the lecture and took notes. It saddened me to see that we are incapable of producing a scholar on our own history and culture who could tell us about our writers, academics, leaders and cultural traditions.

The tragedy is that our researchers and scholars have no depth and insight and produce substandard, superficial work. Mostly our scholars have no knowledge of research methodology, new trends, material, theories and interpretations. Even recent publications are not accessible to them as our libraries have no funds to buy books. Our archives departments

are bureaucratized to the extent that it is impossible for a scholar to obtain a single document from there.

A few years ago I visited the documentation centre when it was located in Lahore and requested a document published in 1935. I was asked to write an application first and wait for two or three days for the reply. The answer was quite simple: the document was classified and could not be issued. That was the end of my research.

Our academic decline has reached the stage where it is now well nigh impossible to obtain any information on ancient Indian history because it requires knowledge of ancient languages and we simply do not have the facility to learn them. The medieval period that we call "Muslim rule" is also neglected because there is need to learn Persian to read and consult original sources. We produced a couple of books in the early years only. That is all. We have no experts who specialize in our recent history.

The result is that foreign universities and research institutes take interest in our history and culture and dominate our knowledge system. They have resources, interest, and motives. They know more about our history, culture, and society than our scholars do. Now, we see our image in their mirror, as we do not have a mirror of our own.

The same is the case with archeology. Last year I went to Turbat. Their friends took me to a site where some French archaeologists were excavating a mound. They told me that they were interested in investigating the trade and commercial links between the Gulf, Iran and the Mesopotamian civilization. I asked them if there were any Pakistani archeologists working with them. The answer was in the negative. The same was the case of the Mehargarh archaeological site. The French excavated it, documented it and left it to decay. The discovery of Mehargarh remains unknown to the majority of Pakistanis. It is not mentioned in our textbooks. (Interestingly the nuclear explosion was immediately incorporated as a chapter in the textbooks in Balochistan).

It has been reported that illegal excavations are taking place in the Frontier and Punjab by people to get hold of gold and silver coins and ancient artifacts which they sell to

foreigners at throwaway prices. We all know that our historical monuments are decaying. There are cases of encroachment and land grabbing. In the process of which historical evidence is fast disappearing and with it is vanishing our sense of history.

This raises two questions: why is there such apathy on our side? And what will be the result of this apathy? The reason ·of our apathy and lack of interest is that we imprison our knowledge system within the framework of an ideology. Our historians are supposed to write history in order to justify that ideology, which results in the distortion of events. That is why history has suffered immensely. For dissident historians there is no place. Neither are they liked by the state nor by society.

Finding no space, their views remain confined to a small circle and have no impact on society. Archaeologists are expected to excavate only those sites which show the glory of the Muslim rule as in the case of Bhambore, and Mansurah. The state has no interest in ancient monuments relating to the pre-Islamic period. UNESCO could take care of them.

Once we have lost our own knowledge system and depend on others, a shallowness develops and ignorance overpowers us which saps our energy and creativity. This is evident in our failure to produce or add to our literature, social sciences, natural sciences, and fine arts. Such a nation is destined to live as a pariah. It cannot claim a dignified existence.

The Price of Knowledge

I was reading the joint autobiography of Will Durant and his wife Ariel in which the husband gives details of his routine as a writer. Writing on his early period he mentioned that he resigned from his teaching post when his book 'Story of Philosophy' became a bestseller and he earned enough money as royalty. He decided to become a full-time writer and devoted all his time for writing and lecturing.

As his reputation spread, he was invited throughout America by social, cultural, religious, and literary associations and organizations, clubs, colleges and universities for lectures. Newspapers were after him to write articles and features on history and politics. These lectures and writings in newspaper were not free. In the 1930s, he was paid a remuneration ranging from $500 to $1000 per lecture and article: a good amount of money in those days. The result was that he lived comfortably till his death.

It is a long established tradition in the west to pay scholars for their contribution. Sometimes, there is an admission fee for a lecture of scholars and people pay it happily. Knowledge is regarded valuable. It is not free.

On the contrary, in our society, knowledge is not regarded precious enough to be paid. Our colleges, universities, and different organizations invite scholars and expect that they should transmit their knowledge without any payment. There is no regard or care that how they survive and how they earn their livelihood. What is worse they try to exploit their 'sense of mission' or 'service' to community or society. It has becomes discourteous to ask for payment of your knowledge.

Literary magazines and academic journals here are financially not sound to pay their contributors. Mostly, they publish 500 copies and survive in very difficult circumstances. In the Urdu newspapers, it is said that contributors are not paid at

all and in some cases, reportedly, the contributor had to pay for publishing his/her article.

The question is why there are such different approaches to knowledge? The plausible explanation is that in the west knowledge is considered as a commodity. Therefore, it is neither cheap nor free. That is why scholars and writers are judged by the standard of their writings and are paid accordingly. Not only state institutions but also private organisations require their intellectual input and for it they pay happily.

On the other hand, in our society, we regard knowledge not as a commodity but as something spiritual that is beyond payment. Scholars are expected to transmit their knowledge to their disciples and students without charging any fee. To get any material benefit is considered equivalent to polluting knowledge system. Therefore, scholars are supposed to endure poverty and shun material comforts of life for the sake of knowledge.

In the Indian mythology, there is a story that once there was quarrel between Sarswati (deity of knowledge) and Lukshami (deity of wealth). In the end Sarswati cursed Lukshami that she would be possessed throughout her life by fools and crooks. The curse proved correct but Sarswati remains dependent on Lukshami for her survival.

The other factor is the difference between industrial and agricultural societies. In the industrial societies, knowledge has a material value but in the feudal and agricultural society it is restricted to the upper classes. That is why, there was a tradition that nobles employed teachers to come to their residence and teach their children. In that case the status of a teacher was reduced to a servant. The madrassa was the teaching institution for commoners. The teacher survived either on charity or on small endowments granted by the state. In either case, he had to live in poverty that was eulogized by the society as a great virtue.

Another reason why knowledge is not respected in traditional societies is because these are afraid of new ideas that could challenge their structure. Therefore, in such a society, knowledge remains stagnant. The society assumes that it has complete system of knowledge and there is no need to acquire anything new. This attitude becomes great hurdle in learning

new things and consequently it discourages scholars to oppose the established system of knowledge. In such societies, only those scholars are respected who support the existing system and provide logic and justification for it. As such, use of rhetoric and phraseology rather than logic and rationality appeal the mind of people.

There is no doubt that Pakistani society is changing and it is paying for the knowledge that has some market value. But there is a difference—students only pay their teachers to learn how to pass their examination. They are not interested to learn anything beyond their curriculum. Their attitude towards knowledge as a whole is still contemptuous. Generally, people are not eager to learn new ideas and confront new thoughts. Those scholars who pursue this goal are condemned to suffer economically and socially. They are simply marginalised.

In the absence of a new knowledge system, Pakistani society has failed to respond to the new challenges of the modern age. In developing a new knowledge system it is important to separate state and society as state tends to use knowledge for its interest. There should be independent research institutes that could not only challenge the state and its policies but also endeavour to change the mindset of society.

The Strong Spirit of Resistance

The most important role which has been played in creating political consciousness was the formation and organization of political parties

The popular definition of politics is that it is an art and science of government: therefore, those who know this art, are capable to govern and administer; those who are novices, devastate the whole system of government and create chaos. This definition raises a pertinent question which perturbs the scholars and academicians: how to control a government and how to maintain law and order in a society?

There are two groups of intellectuals who put forward two antithetical views in response to this question. One group argues that a rational and moral political order can be achieved because human nature is inherently good and tends to believe in peace and order. If there is any mismanagement or mal-administration, the cause of it is depravity of the power group that is responsible for its supervision. In this case, implementation of just laws and transmitting proper education can reform a society.

In the opinion of second group, human nature is inherently evil and as such it opposes realisation of moral principles. Moreover, there is a clash of interests that creates disorder and chaos in society. This problem can be resolved by adopting a policy of 'checks and balances' and settling the conflicts on mutual understanding. In this process, historical precedents instead of abstract principles should be adopted as a policy.

Politics cannot play any effective role unless there is political consciousness among different segments of a society. This raises another question—how and in what way political consciousness should be created? According to scholars, for this, first of all one must acquire historical knowledge. The knowledge of history creates not only a sense of identity, but

leads to the understanding of process of change in every aspect of society. It also asserts that there are no absolute values and traditions; everything is in a process of change; and change requires efforts of a society to reconstruct and reshape its values and institutions again and again. One must know that ideas and values remain valid according to the needs of time. Knowledge of political ideas is an important ingredient of political consciousness; without understanding political systems which change from time to time, a group or class cannot grasp its role in a society.

One should also keep in mind that there are variations of political consciousness from class to class. The ruling class has its own consciousness that is different to the consciousness of masses. Ruling classes are interested to keep their privileges and status on the basis of their birth and wealth. They are afraid of people's political awareness. It is in their interest to keep people backward so that they cannot challenge their privileges and status. To check political consciousness among masses, ruling classes adopt different methods ranging from censorship of knowledge, control on curriculum of education to propaganda of their values and traditions, and moral justification of hierarchical social order.

However, in spite of all checks, a natural process of awakening makes the masses aware of what they are, what they feel, and what they wish. The experience of misery, exploitation, and humiliation create a strong spirit of resistance that consequently leads them to understand the complexities of society and workings of the political system.

Once, masses become politically conscious, they like to change the whole system either radically or by reforming society with the association of sympathetic and politically active groups.

It is evident from history that the evolution of political consciousness in any society remains uneven. In the first stage, ruling classes become conscious of their power and how to hold it permanently. In the second stage, growing middle class demands share in the power politics and struggle for their rights. In the third stage, as a result of democratisation, masses are involved in politics and become aware of their fundamental

rights. In all three cases, class interest dominates political consciousness of each group.

In the medieval period, in the West as well as in the East, the universal system was monarchy in which all powers were concentrated in one person. People were regarded as 'subjects' and were obliged to be loyal and faithful to their king. Involvement in politics was regarded as a crime, a taboo and people were not allowed to talk about the affairs of state or critcise the king and his policies. The most serious crime was rebellion and rebels were considered personal enemies of the ruler and therefore severely punished. The psyche of the society can be explained by a verse of famous Persian poet Hafiz who says that "mysteries and affairs of the art of government are known only to the rulers". People had no part to play in it. King ruled on the basis of 'divine rights' and not on the consent of his subjects. Therefore, he was responsible to God and not to his people. That age obviously required ignorance among people rather than political consciousness.

In the modern period we observe a change in the structure of the American and Western societies. The American War of Independence (1775-1781) involved people in the struggle against Britain. But once independence was achieved; its leaders cheated the people and preserved their elitist status. In the process of constitution making the radical element was excluded. However, after two years, ten amendments known as "the Bill of Rights" guarantee some fundamental rights of people such as freedom of worship, speech, press, and assembly etc. The French Revolution of 1789, on the contrary, brought radical changes in Europe. Though, the middle classes controlled it but the pressure of the masses was tremendous. They gathered inside and outside the Assembly building and watched the proceedings. The result of it was that the Feudal lords, afraid of the rising of peasantry in the rural areas, proposed to abolish feudalism on August 4, 1789 and included the 'Declaration of Rights of Man' in the constitution of 1791, which guaranteed the fundamental rights of people.

The process of constitution making throughout the West changed the old structure of society. People transformed from 'subjects' to 'citizens'. Further sovereignty of people replaced

the sovereignty of king. People also experienced that their power could change a society. Though middle classes made attempts to take all benefits and exclude 'people' from the process of politicisation, but once the power of people was unleashed, it could not be checked by force or coercion. Political consciousness of masses played an effective role in history in changing the political system and bringing about democratisation of government and society.

To pressurize and influence the government, people evolved new methods—demonstrations that show their strength and also paralyse the working of government; strikes in factories and offices; campaign of boycott and picketing against certain institutions or government department; circulation of pamphlets among people to create awareness of social, political, and economic issues; launching a signature campaign to involve people in expressing their demands or their opinion. Moreover, writing articles and letters in newspapers and magazines are widely used by political groups to voice their grievances.

However, the most important role which has been played in creating political consciousness was the formation and organisation of political parties. To win election and popular support, these parties mobilise people, organise them, and provide them information on all political, social and economic issues, and keep them well aware of country's condition. Besides political parties, there are social, literary, and cultural groups that contribute progressive and enlightened ideas to understand society and its problems. The accumulated result is political consciousness which gives power to a society to reject or to accept what is in its interest.

Rebellions in History

The study of history shows us that rebellion was the most effective method used by disgruntled and unsatisfied elements in the mediaeval period, both in the East and West, to fight and raise voice against injustices and exploitation. However, the nature and motives of rebellion differed from time to time and from place to place.

For example, there were rebellions of the members of royal families who wanted to topple the government in order to capture power. The other kind of rebellion was of aristocracy, whose interest was to get more concessions and privileges for their class. However, the most threatening rebellions were by peasants who challenged the political authority and wanted to change or reform the structure of state in their favour. That is why such types of rebellions were regarded as great danger to the ruling class and immediate actions were taken to crush them.

In the beginning of this century, historians took great interest in peasant rebellions and reconstructed their movements with the help of official documents, institutional records, judicial proceedings and folk literature. Such histories broke many myths about peasants, who were portrayed as illiterate and inexperienced in political matters. The records, on the contrary, show that they had the ability to organize, settle disputes, negotiate and inspire their fellows to struggle.

Sometimes, in the official histories, it appears that there was no impact of their rebellions and they were simply crushed without any resistance. However, deep studies show that as a result of their rebellions, the ruling classes and political powers had to change their strategies, and in some cases it led to the restructuring of the whole state and its agencies. These studies also show that it is a wrong impression that ordinary people did not contribute in making history. On the other hand, their contribution was immense. They were not passive spectators, but active contributors in the process of history.

Wayne T. Brake, in his book *Shaping History: Ordinary People in European Politics*, 1500-1700 traces peasants' rebellions and their consequences on state and society. He focuses on the rebellions that occurred in the 16th and 17th centuries against kings and feudal lords in the different countries of Europe. These rebellions were well organized and motivated. The peasants elected their leaders who had the capacity to organize armies and to fight against royal forces. As most of the peasants were raw, therefore they trained them in warfare and inspired them to fight against injustice. It was also the task of these leaders to keep different rebellions groups in unity. The manifestos issued by the peasants during their rebellions show their political insight and commitment to their cause. These manifestos had a future vision of a society where everybody could get his share and rights; it demanded the reduction of the ruler's authority; and to reform the state administration. The most attractive provision was the concept of equality in society; a dream which all unprivileged classes wanted to realize.

One of the characteristics of these rebellions was that religion was used on both sides. The ruling authorities urged peasants to be loyal to the king and desist from denying his authority. They quoted from the Bible that love, patience and submission were required by Christ to be followed by people. Peasants, on the other hand, also used religion in their favour m 1526, there was a peasant rebellion in Swabia (Germany) where the peasants, besides demanding their grievances, also declared that: "It has until now been the custom for the lords to own us as their property. This is deplorable, for Christ redeemed and brought us all with his precious blood, the lowliest shepherd as well as the great lord, with no exception. Thus, the Bible proves that we are free and want to be free."

When Luther revolted against the Church and Pope, it divided the church into two sects: Protestants and Catholics. However, the result of this revolt was that both sects reformed their organizations and institutions in order to face challenges. The Catholic Church, losing authority and its disciples, reorganized and restructured under counter-Reformation. This revolt against the church, however, inspired the peasants throughout Europe to revolt for their rights. They argued that

when the church could be reformed as a result of rebellion, why not state? This unleashed peasants rebellions throughout Europe. In Germany, Luther, whose revolt was successful because of the support of the German princes, condemned the peasants' rebellion. He exhorted the rule crush these rebellions with a stern hand and declared that the authority of the state was very important and if it was challenged and weakened by uprisings, society would be disintegrated.

It is proved that rebellions played a very significant role in history. They broke the stagnancy of society and mobilized some sections of society to act and change outdated and obsolete traditions and institutions. Though most of these rebellions were crushed, they still left their marks on society. Even after losing their struggle, they forced rulers and authorities to change and reform. If authorities refused to change and accept the process of change, such societies either faced rebellions after rebellions and disintegrated, or remained backward and stagnant.

Rebellions in Medieval India

In the history of mediaeval India that includes the Sultanate and Mughal periods, there were different types of rebellions against the ruling dynasties and reigning monarchs. There were rebellions of peasants as well as uprisings of political ambitious individuals and groups. So why were there so many rebellions during this period? The main cause was the nature of the absolute form of government that was not ready to accommodate any opposition and allowed nobody to defy ruling authority.

The other reason that could be applied to the Sultanate period (1206-1526) was that nearly all-ruling dynasties had no legitimacy except military power. This principle of 'use of power' inspired all those politically ambitious individuals who, following in the footstep of the reigning monarch, wanted to oust him and capture power. Moreover, success of such attempts encouraged them to take risks and make attempts to overthrow the government. We have many such examples in the history of the Sultans of Delhi.

Jalauddin Khilji (1290-1296) snatched power from the family of Balban. Alauddin (1296-1336), his Nephew, on the other hand, revolted against him and assumed kingship after assassinating him. He faced a number of rebellions as well. This forced him to undertake a number of social and political reforms to check them, such as prohibition of wine, ban on social activities (no intermarriages among nobles without his permission), confiscation of properties and spying on aristocracy.

During the Mughal rule (1526-1857), the nature of rebellions changed as the Mughal dynasty legitimized its rule by consolidating its political power. Therefore, there were two types of rebellions during this period. Firstly, local rebellions either by *zamindars* or Mughal nobles to reform the administration. Secondly, there were rebellions of the Mughal princes within the

dynasty to claim political power, such as Jahangir, Khusraw, Shahjahan and later on, his sons who revolted against the central authority to get power.

The interesting phenomenon of these rebellions was that there was no dearth of recruits. As soon as the rebel leader declared his revolt, people, mostly peasants, offered their services to fight. Therefore, the leaders had the cause to fight, but not the peasant soldiers who joined the rebel army because of unemployment and in the hope to loot and plunder because there was no system of regular salary or payment. Sometimes, they were paid at the time of recruitment. Otherwise, there was no bond of loyalty to the rebel leaders. That is why these soldiers remained unstable and ran away from battlefields as soon as they saw signs of defeat. Compared to the royal forces, they were not well-equipped and well-trained. That was the reason that these rebellions largely remained unsuccessful.

There is no doubt that by challenging the ruling dynasty, these rebellions made attempts to shake the stability and consolidation of the kingdom. If the existing power handled them properly and crushed them, it was proof that it was in a position to absorb such shocks. For example, Muhammad Tughluq (1325-1351) faced so many rebellions that he became tired and failed to suppress them. That is why Ziauddin Barani, on his death, wrote: "He got rid of people and people got rid of him."

- In another case, Akbar, feeling himself secured, instead of punishing, pardoned most of the rebels. It showed that the Mughal empire was so solidly consolidated that the rebellions were not dangerous to its existence. Even in the later period, during the rule of Farrukh Siyar (1713-1719), the Mughals were in a position to crush the rebellion of Banda Babadur, the Sikh rebel. However, Nadir Shah and Ahmad Shah Abdali completely reduced their power and they became mere puppets in the hands of the Marahattas and, the East-India Company.

As rulers concentrated all powers in their persons, they regarded rebels as their personal enemies. After defeat, they were either summarily exerted or in some cases, intercession of some powerful element at the court. However, the policy was toward exemplary punishments in order to discourage further rebellions.

For example, when there was rebellion of Tughral in Bengal in 1279 against Balban, he himself marched in spite of his old age and crushed it. To show his contempt for rebels, he ordered that gibbets should fee erected on both sides of the bazaar of Lukhnowti and companions of Tughral were hanged indiscriminately. His advice to his son, Bughra Khan, who was appointed as the governor of Bengal was that: "If ever designing and evil-minded persons should incite you to waver in your allegiance to Delhi and to throw off its authority, then remember the vengeance that you have seen in the bazaar."

In case of the rebellion of prince Khusraw in 1606 against Jahangir, his followers were also punished mercilessly. Two of his supporters, Hussain Beg and Abdur Rahim, were sewn up in the fresh skins of ox and ass, respectively. Hussaub Beg died of suffocation, while Abdur Rahim was rescued on the plea of some influential nobles. On the other hand, nearly 500 rebel soldiers were arrested and hanged publicly. Khusraw was ordered to pass through the row of the gibbets and see the fate of his men.

There is a lesson from history rulers and governments must understand grievances and problems of their people and reform and reorganize the state structure according to the need of the time. It keeps the government stable. Otherwise, the ruling classes have to spend their resources to suppress the opposite forces and subsequently make them weak.

From Rebellion to Agitation

In the absolute forms of government disgruntled elements and dissatisfied groups either rebel or form secret societies topple government. Rebellions and uprisings are considered treason against kings or dictators who treat people as subjects and not as citizens. However, the situation changes when democratic institutions and tradition emerge and provide different methods such as agitation, boycott, strikes, and demonstration to mobilise people and pressurize governments to accept their demands. Politics no longer remains a taboo but becomes a part of life.

In India, the first reaction of people against the policies of the East India Company was the revolt of 1857 that was ruthlessly crushed. However, the political condition changed after 1857 when India was ruled by the crown and parliament. After the constitutional reforms were introduced, the Indians slowly learnt how to use democratic methods for demanding their rights and formed political groups and parties.

A new chapter of politicisation of the Indian society began when the government under viceroy Curzon decided to partition Bengal in 1905. It shocked the Bengali nationalists who saw in partition a blow to their unity and their nationalist aspirations. There was a strong reaction against it. In order t to pressurize the government they boycotted the English goods. The main motive of the movement known as 'swadeshi' was to hit the British textile mills and at the same time help the Indian industrialists to manufacture cloth for the Indians. In the first stage the agitation was peaceful and methods of petition, memoranda, delivering speeches in public meetings, publishing articles and letters in newspapers were used. Parallel institutions such as private schools were set up to boycott the government ones. Art was used to promote political consciousness. Rabindranath Tagore wrote his famous song 'Amar sonar Bengal'—now the national anthem of Bangladesh—during this

agitation. When these peaceful methods failed to achieve anything, then different Bengali groups resorted to violent activities. Secret societies were organised with the aim to destabilise the government. The British government reacted strongly—imposing censorship, banning political organisations, students unions, and political demonstrations, and not allowing training in martial arts—and harshly sentenced those who were found involving in agitation.

In the end, King George V announced the annulment of the partition in 1911 in a coronation darbar held at Delhi which, consequently, proved the success of political agitation. The Congress party supported the agitation throughout India that made the government uneasy. But it had quite a different reaction among the Muslims.

The Muslims were disillusioned by the decision because they benefited by the partition in East Bengal. So far, they had remained loyal to the British but this loyalty was now being questioned. It also intensified their differences with the Hindus, already sour as result of the Hindi-Urdu conflict.

By that time though the old leadership which preached loyalty and aloofness from politics was replaced by the young educated generation who learned their political lesson from the recent political development and realised that they should also adopt the same methods for the fulfillment of their demands. Hasrat Mohani, Muhammad Ali Jauhar, Dr. Ansari were the young leaders who emerged as anti-British Muslims, became conscious of their minority status in India and the attachment with Pan-Islamism, indicated their fear of insecurity in India. This led to their involvement in the Khilafat movement. But when Mustafa Kamal abolished the khilafat in 1924, they lost the last symbol of their unity and power. One positive impact was that they concentrated their efforts on their own problems in India. This attitude led them to 'two Nation' concept and the demand for a separate homeland.

After partition in 1947, a major political change occurred which was not noticed either by politicians or by people; with the collapse of the colonial state, the status of people transformed from 'subject' to 'citizen'. Now, as a citizen, a Pakistani has all fundamental rights that are ensured in all

constitutions of nation states. The problem was that with the change of status of people, the structure of the state remained colonial thus creating a gap between people and the state.

Although, the Muslim masses were charged by political activities and ready to take part in the building of newly independent country, they were soon disappointed because the new leadership was conscious of its own political interests and did not like people to take any part in political process. Change of governments took place not because of elections but because of intrigues and behind the curtain political activities. The first constitution was drafted in 1956 that was abrogated by the military government in 1958. And all political parties were banned. After the 1970 election, there was a brief period when the masses were politicised but again the coming of military government ceased the process and a campaign began to depoliticise people. This process has gone on ever since.

The pertinent question here is: why did people become depoliticised? The reason perhaps is that whenever people tried to act strong, hoping to bring about a change, successive failures made them lose all interest in political activity. This explanation generates another question: why did political parties fail to mobilise people and use their strength and energy for restructuring society?

The reason is the structure of Pakistan's political parties—the Muslim League, the parent party, built its structure purely on elitist lines. People were mobilised only when it was in the interest of the Muslim League. This interest diminished after partition. Thenceforth, it remained in power by using intrigues and conspiracies. Its leadership, with the exception of Muhammad Ali Jinnah, belonged to the feudal class. Other political parties picked up the same model. Those who headed the party treated it as their jagir rather than democratising it.

If the condition of political parties is so dismal and appalling, then who is going to change the society? There are different social, cultural, literary, and charitable groups, but their scope is limited. Their argument being that any involvement in politics would create problems in their social work.

There is a need of a political party that could challenge the present social, political, and economic structures. It should

have leadership from below and its activities must be supported by intellectuals, writers, scholars, artists, musicians, industrialists and traders. Only such a political party could create political consciousness among the masses, and if there is strong will, the vision could materialise.

Dilemma of Minorities

The attitude of the majority towards a minority, whether it is religious, linguistic, or ethnic, is generally hostile and suspicious because of the perception that the minority, keeping itself separate and aloof, renders harm to the nation and damages unity. As unity is regarded as a source of strength and power to face hardships and respond to challenges, the "secession" of a group of people on the basis of sectarianism, language or ethnicity is considered treason.

To maintain and sustain unity, the majority continuously forces the minorities into assimilating within the broader framework of national culture. Any step by a minority to deviate from the common cultural framework and prevalent norms is regarded as a threat to the unity of society.

In multi-cultural empires, such as Roman, Abbasid, Ottoman or Austro-Hungarian, minorities felt safe and secure because political power concentrated in the person of the emperor and his bureaucracy. No group had the power to exploit or oppress any other. But in the case of the nation-state, the situation has reversed.

The concept of nation-state is based on nationalism, which requires minorities to give up their identities and become part of the nation. Any attempt on the part of a minority to assert its own separate identity is considered a threat to the very existence of the nation-state. In such cases, the response of the nation-state and its institutions is very harsh and ruthless.

For example, in modern Turkey, the Kurds are not allowed to identify themselves as Kurds. They are legally bound to call themselves Turks or "mountain Turks." The same is true of Iran, where Turkish-speaking Azerbaijanis are forced to assimilate into Iranian nationalism. Even in Europe, in spite of its professed liberalism and constitutional rights, Muslim girls in France are not allowed to wear scarves to show their identity.

In Pakistan, from the very beginning, attempts have been made by successive governments to coerce regional minorities so as to eliminate their identities. This action from the above created resentment among the regional groups. In response they negated the very ideology of Pakistan and asserted their regional identity based on regional nationalism.

Besides this, non-Muslim minorities are further discriminated against on the basis of their beliefs. To deprive them of their status as equal citizens, they are told that since they did not take any part in the struggle for Pakistan, they do not deserve to have the same rights as other citizens.

In India there is a campaign against the Christian minority, because, the BJP, as a fundamentalist party, is afraid that the conversion of the tribal and lower caste people would increase the number of Christians, which might affect election results. The BJP is the champion of Hindutva i.e. to unite all Hindus on the basis of religion and culture. As minorities have no space in this framework, they have, in the eyes of the BJP, become a great hurdle in the way of the kind of Hinduized India envisaged by the BJP.

The question is: how have minorities responded to these challenges in history? In the past minorities, in order to survive and to keep their identities, adopted a number of strategies and tactics. For example, in some cases outwardly they assimilated into the majority, but secretly preserved their faith and evolved symbols and customs to keep them internally united and strong.

The Shia community kept its separate identity by adopting the principle of Taqiyya (Dissimulation).

After the fall the last Moorish kingdom of Granada in 1492, the Muslim minority converted to Christianity but kept their religion secret. However, the community was suspected by the Christian government and ultimately disappeared as a result of persecution.

Another alternative for minorities has been to migrate to such countries where they could be tolerated. The French Protestants, as a result of discrimination, migrated to England and Germany where they enriched these countries by their skill as artisans.

After the discovery of the New World, the persecuted religious minorities got the opportunity to migrate to this newfound, haven of safety.

In some cases, minorities, after leaving the mainland, settled in inaccessible places where they could feel secure. The Druz went to the mountainous areas of Lebanon and Syria for safety. In such cases, however, minorities paid a heavy price by staying backward cut-off from the mainstream and from cultural centres.

In Pakistan, we are witnessing the same phenomenon. Non-Muslim minorities, not feeling secure, are leaving the country. The Hindus prefer to go to India, Christians and Ahmadis to the West. In these cases, only to the affluent and the rich can afford to leave and settle in foreign countries. Poor people, as having no resources to go away, to stay on and become victims of the majority.

Where political power rests with a dictator or king, minorities, by supporting him, make an attempt to preserve the status quo and get some concessions. In Iran, the Bahais, by supporting the Shah, got protection and consequently prospered. But after the fall of the Pahlawi monarchy, they were victimized by the new set-up.

Sometimes, minorities seek outside help by aligning themselves with their co-religionists. The Muslim in India during the colonial period made attempts to become a part of the Muslim Ummat. The Shia community of Pakistan draws strength from Iran.

Extra-territorial loyalty further makes the minority an object of suspicion that creates a gulf between itself and the majority.

As a persecuted section of society, minorities adopt anti-history attitude. As it is excluded from mainstream history, it becomes history-less. As such it has no past, no status in history, no contribution to civilization and culture and, therefore, no respect in society.

Sometimes, minorities construct their own history separate from mainstream, but memories of persecution and humiliation give them a sense of oppression and exploitation which consequently turn them against historical processes. As

they do not have any place in mainstream history, they become alienated from history.

That is why, there is a new approach among minorities not to write their separate history but "induct" their contribution into the mainstream history and assert their presence in the historical process in order to get recognition.

This is what the blacks are doing in the United States. They believe that by writing history, they will alienate themselves from the main body. Therefore, black historians are writing national history and asserting their contribution to the development of America. They believe that by recognizing themselves historically, they would be able to get a rightful place in society.

However, a minority does not always remain an object of persecution. If it acquires political power, it also becomes an exploiter. As power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely, it plays havoc with other groups. In Syria, under Hafiz al Asad, the Alavi sect rules over other groups and ruthlessly crushed all opposition in the past.

If a minority becomes an economic power and refuses to share its privileges with the majority and keeps its high status and prosperity by adopting arrogant attitude, it invites the wrath of the majority.

We have witnessed how the Chinese in Indonesia have suffered and were victimized. The Indians in Uganda faced the anger of the people of Uganda and had to leave the country. Recently, in Fiji, the local population reacted against the Indians because of their arrogant attitude and by not sharing economic benefits with them.

In some cases, minorities have behaved intelligently by adopting a low-profile attitude, shunning politics and concentrating on commerce and industry. In the subcontinent, for instance, Khojas, Memons and Bohris among Muslims and Marwaris and other Gujerati-speaking communities among the Hindus have concentrated solely on trading and later on industry to prosper.

Of special significance has been the attitude of the Parsi community in South Asia. It prospered under the British, but avoided any kind of political involvement that would have

invited a backlash from the Hindus and the Muslims. However, while confining themselves to commerce and industry, the Parsis involved themselves with social work. Their speciality has been city politics in which they concentrated basically on charitable and civic projects that helped all citizens irrespective of their race or religion. For this reason, the Parsi community is one of the few minorities in the world that has not earned the majority's hostility.

In Europe and North America, the Jews have behaved identically. Knowing well that government jobs would be denied to them, the Jews took up trading in a big way. As Europe entered the Age of Enlightenment and European nation-states became secular in character, the Jews profited from it and developed into owners of industrial and financial empires.

Another feature of Jewish life for the last one and a half centuries has been to concentrate on education, science and research. For this reason, the Jews have produced some of Europe's leading scientists and philosophers—Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud and Albert Einstein, to name only a few. They also shunned politics.

However, lately there has been a slight deviation from this phenomenon. For the last half a century, especially after the coming into existence of the state of Israel, the Jews in the Western world have started manipulating Western European and north American political institutions to ensure the West's unqualified political, financial and military support to Israel.

American Congress and its various committees, the American print and electronic media and the U.S. academic and research institutions which shape public opinion and often distort developments in the Middle East for the benefit of Israel are manipulated behind the scenes by well-entrenched Jewish lobbies. How long they can sustain this role and whether this will invite the majority's backlash remains to be seen.

Keeping in view the dilemma of minorities the question is how to integrate them in the mainstream. A democratic-secular structure provides this opportunity. It allows a minority to keep its identity but at the same time become a part of the nationhood and contribute to its development.

One thing must be understood—the strength of unity lies not in total oneness but in recognizing multi-cultural and religious entities on the basis of equality.

Jinnah: Making of a Myth

Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah had all the qualities and characteristic in his personality which go into the making of a myth. He was reticent, reserved, kept his personal matters secret, behaved coolly and proudly and was not warm towards anybody. Thus he created a halo of awe and fear around himself.

Sri Prakash, the first Indian High Commissioner to Karachi, in his book Pakistan: Birth and Early Years gives an account of a reception which was given by the Governor-General of Pakistan, just after Independence to the diplomatic corps. It was also attended by the party leaders and bureaucrats. According to his version, Mr. Jinnah was sitting at a distance alone on a sofa and called one by one those he wanted to talk to. He exchanged notes with each one of them just for five minutes. To the High Commissioner, he appeared a lonely man, averse to people. His serious and somber expression made all those who interacted with him uneasy in his company.

This conveyed the impression that he was the final authority in every matter. The Muslim League and its leaders were merely rubber stamps. His image of being the sole spokesman of his party and people created a number of myths. For instance, the myth about his serious illness which is recounted by Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre in their book Freedom at Midnight fascinates everybody and compels readers to take it seriously. The version of their story is:

"If Louis Mountbatten, Jawaharlal Nehru or Mahatma Gandhi had been aware in April 1947 of one extraordinary secret, the division threatening India might have been avoided. The secret was sealed onto the gray surface of a film, a film that could have upset the Indian political equation and would almost certainly have changed the course of Asian history. Yet, so precious was the secret that film harboured that even the British

CID, one of the most effective investigative agencies in the world, was ignorant of its existence."

These were the X-rays of Jinnah diagnosed as a TB patient. The authors, after creating a suspense, further write that: "The damage was so extensive that the man whose lungs were on the film had barely two or three years to live. Sealed in an unmarked envelope, those X-rays were locked in the office safe of Dr J. A. L. Patel, a Bombay physician."

On the basis of the story, Jinnah emerged as the one on whom depended the whole movement of Pakistan. The story further becomes interesting when a Hindu doctor kept the secret at the cost of Indian unity. His professional integrity was more important than his political inclinations.

In 1997, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of India-Pakistan Independence, Patrick French published a book, Liberty or death. After his own investigation, French refutes the whole story narrated by Collins and Lapierre. According to him: "The idea that Jinnah's poor state of health was a closely guarded secret is absurd: it was referred to in the press at that time, and it is obvious from photographs taken in the mid-1940s that Jinnah was unwell.

Moreover, the reduction of the Muslim League's wide popular backing to the whim of one man's 'rigid and inflexible' attitude is indicative of the way that Pakistan history has been traduced. A second problem with Collins and Lapierre's story is that it is not correct. Jinnah did not go to Bombay in May or June 1946, since he was busy in negotiating with Cripps in Simla and New Delhi. Nor did he have a doctor by the name of J. A. L. Patel. Although it is possible that Jinnah had tuberculosis in 1946, there is no evidence among his archive papers to support the theory."

However, Jinnah himself on many occasions expressed the view that he was the sole creator of Pakistan. In one of his famous quotes, he said that he and his typewriter made Pakistan. The statement disregarded the efforts of his colleagues and the other Muslim League leaders in the Pakistan movement. It also downgraded the people's participation in the struggle for a separate homeland.

There is evidence that he did not think highly of the leaders of the Muslim League. He found them mediocre and not capable of leading the nation. Perhaps, that was the reason that Jinnah, knowing his fatal illness, accepted 'the moth eaten and truncated Pakistan'. The later history of Pakistan vindicates Jinnah's assessment of the Muslim League leaders who miserably failed to solve the problems of a nascent nation.

The failure of these leaders has boosted Jinnah's image as a superman. He overshadowed everybody. The nation also paid respect to him by naming universities, colleges, airports, roads, hospitals, and institutions of different kinds after him with the result that a citizen of Pakistan feels his presence every where in the country, wherever he goes.

Moreover, his image as a "Great Leader" (the Quaid-i-Azam) is presented in the textbooks to mould the mind of the young generation encouraging them to follow in his footstep. Scholars are eulogizing different aspects of his life. A film is screened to counter the film Gandhi in which Attenborough distorts the image of Jinnah. These efforts have made Jinnah sacrosanct. Any criticism of him is regarded a treason. He has become a paragon of super human virtues, beyond all weaknesses normal in human being.

The reverence accorded to him is such that mere association with him catapults a person from a humble position to the rank of freedom fighter. People take pride in their claim to have shaken hands with him (though he avoided shaking hands with people), or having seen him, talked to him, or merely attended his public meeting. The rulers of Pakistan, realizing the impact of his association, create myths of their links with him. Z.A. Bhutto claimed that as a student he wrote a letter to the Quaid—it is not known whether he replied to that letter or not, Zia's sycophant bureaucrats discovered a diary of Jinnah (that was the time when Hitler's diaries were discovered and later on proved false) which disappeared along with him.

Nawaz Sharif, assuming to follow in his footsteps, called himself 'Quaid-i-Sani' (the second leader). One such similar example is found in the history of France when Napoleon III made an attempt to revive the image of Napoleon I in order to legitimize his authority. Marx jokingly comments in The

eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte that "Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second as farce." Nawaz Sharif's self-given title proves it.

Jinnah has become such a symbol of wisdom in the Pakistani society that people visualize Pakistan with his reference. His vision, his agenda, his dream and his ideals, all remained unaccomplished because he died soon after Independence. It is commonly believed that had he lived some more years, the history of Pakistan would have been different. There are few nations which rely so heavily on one individual.

No doubt, Jinnah was a great leader of his people. He was a man of integrity and honesty, but to idealize him to such an extent as to preempt the emergence of another rank of leaders out of his shadow is strange. Every generation has its own dreams and vision which it wants to accomplish without interference. Not imitation but freedom is required to build a new world. Therefore, an attempt should not be made to repeat but to make new history. People should be liberated from the shadows and allowed to flourish in a free society. Great leaders should be respected but not worshipped.

Unity, Faith and Discipline

Fascism, by Martin Kitchen, Macmillan 1990, Pp. 106

Fascism has become a household word to be used for any repressive act committed by an individual or a party. Any government which follows the policy of totalitarianism and is intolerant of opposition is referred to as fascist. Martin Kitchen, Associate Professor at Simon Fraser University, Canada, and the author of "The German Officer Corps" 1890-1914 and "A Military History of Germany", briefly and lucidly elaborates and examines the origin and the different theories of Fascism. In his opinion, fascism as a movement must be determined by social factors and not by national character. It is a product of a society which blocks the further development of the freedom of man.

The fascist movements in Italy and Germany rendered a heavy blow to the communist parties because they attracted the masses and united both capitalists and proletariat into one block. The communists interpreted the origin of fascism as a result of the contradictions in advanced capitalism. However, the social scientists, on the basis of historical experience, outline the main characteristics of fascism. According to their study fascism rejects the idea of democracy; opposes organised working class; manipulates the frustration of the masses in such a way as not to threaten the basic structure of the society; defuses social antagonism by the notion of community; establishes the authority of family, state, and capitalists; declares minorities as its enemy. Moreover, it is violently nationalist and the main vehicles of its popularity are a mass party, a charismatic leader, and a distinct ideology.

Franz Neumann, a social scientist, argues that fascism originates in a liberal bourgeois society and restores political stability by smashing the democratic opposition. The economic crisis is controlled by adopting coercive methods and developing armament industry.

Ernst Notte, a historian and leading authority on fascism, analysis the different interpretations of fascism. To the Christians, fascism is the result of the secularisation of society and it could only be prevented by theocracy. To the conservatives, it is the revolt of the masses against the liberal and modern trends. To them, return of the past is the solution to all problems. As far as the materialists are concerned, they sometimes support it and sometime oppose it. Nolte, in his study on Fascism, examines that fascism in the past popularised because of the failure of Liberalism. It was basically anti-Maryian and wanted to destroy it by adopting its methods.

Kitchen examines the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany. The main reason of its rise in Italy was that the industrialists wanted the law wages, destruction of the organised labour movements, protective tariffs, and the state guarantee against economic crisis. In Germany, the industrialists disliked democracy and labour organisations. Therefore, in both countries the capitalists supported fascism in order to exploit the working class after crushing the labour unions and weakening the democratic traditions.

Kitchen, in the end, summarises the main characteristic of Fascism:

1.   It is a phenomenon of developed industrial states.
2.   It results in severe socio-economic crisis which threatens some sections of the society to loose their status and prosperity.
3.   Organised labour frightens the industrialists who, for their survival, support fascism to crush the labour unions. Fascism is only possible when the working class suffers defeat (in Italy it happened in 1920; and in Germany in 1918-23).
4.   It recruits its followers from the panicky petit bourgeois (artisans, small businessmen, and farmers) in the hope of obtaining economic and social salvation.
5.   It protects the property and strengthens Capitalism.
6.   It uses terror against its opponents.
7.   It uses some ideology to attract masses and turns away their frustrations. Authority, obedience, honour, duty, fatherland, and race are the buses of the ideology.
8.   It pursues aggressive and expansionist policy.

The socio-economic system which produced fascism still exists. It could only be checked as pointed out by Eric Fromm by unfolding of free, critical, and spontaneous individuals which is only possible within the framework of democratic socialist state."

Partition Re-Interpreted

An Indian historian was on his visit to Pakistan and met a number of people in order to understand the mind of Pakistani people. In one meeting somebody asked him, "What do you think about partition?" He replied, "A sense of loss." The immediate response was "Your sense of loss is our sense of achievement."

This is how the history of the freedom movement and partition is written on both sides of the border. The Pakistani historians write it with a sense of pride in how the Muslims of India (believing them to be a monolith community) fought on two fronts: the British and the Hindus, and finally achieved their separate homeland on the basis of the two-nation theory.

The nationalist historians of India concentrate on the struggle against colonialism rather than partition which is the last part of the whole drama. Negating the two-nation theory, they emphasize on composite culture and the concept of one nation. They argue that the Muslims subverted the struggle against the British by dividing the nation into two. Instead of joining the national struggle, they involved themselves in communal politics, which subsequently complicated and delayed the freedom of India.

On the other hand, the Indian historians regard the freedom struggle as a mass movement that included all sections of society, irrespective of their ideology and social status. As a result of it, they seized power through people's struggle, which was based on moral, political and ideological values. They also particularly emphasize that the whole movement was constitutional and non-violent in nature (ignoring the contribution of the terrorist and the Ghadar movements).

After independence and partition, historians of different schools of thought have studied and analyzed this phenomenon from different points of view. The British historians are very much concerned about the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist

approaches and they have, therefore, made attempts to justify the positive role of British during the freedom struggle.

The traditionalist historians focus their attention on the frustrated European educated class that used nationalism to mobilize people against the British Raj to fulfill their political ends. This approach denies that the struggle was a mass movement or against the colonial rule or there was any economic exploitation in India.

The Cambridge school of historiography that emerged in the 1960s deals with the freedom movement and imperialism from a different perspective. Its point of view is that there was no anti-imperialist struggle in India. Neither was there any people's movement, nor were people against the British Raj. The adherents of this school argue that during the British rule India was in the process of nation-building and had not yet achieved the status of a nation, It was, as a matter of fact, a conglomeration of castes, religious, linguistic and ethnic communities. As there was no nation in existence, how could any struggle be national?

Denying the struggle as a mass movement, this school asserts that in actuality it was a movement of the elite class, which used different political strategies to achieve its selfish motives. Nationalism was its most effective and useful instrument to hide their ulterior interests and activate people for support.

It is to be noted, the British historians use the term 'transfer of power'. This by its very connotation denies any resistance or struggle against the colonial power. It indicates that the transfer was made peacefully by negotiations.

Historians from the Subaltern school of thought see the whole freedom struggle as a conflict between local and foreign elite classes against the subaltern or subordinate sections of society. To the Subaltern historians, it was not the struggle between the Indian people and the colonial power. There was no unity of Indian people against imperialism. Exploring and emphasizing the people's struggle, they point out that instead of deriving any fruits from their struggle, the people had to give up all the benefits of independence to the elite classes who successfully seized power. On the basis of their study, they call

the nationalist leaders as brokers and agents who negotiated with the colonial government the transfer power to them on behalf of people.

These two interpretations bring us to a third one. Did the majority of the Indians want freedom or was there a fear of independence in some sections of society? The Muslim elite had the fear that if the British left India, they would come under the domination of the Hindus. That was the fear that led the separation of these two communities and finally culminated on the demand for Pakistan.

Like the Muslim minority, the lower castes were also afraid of the hegemony of the upper castes in the case of independence. The leader of the non-Brahman movement of Maharashtra, Jotiro Phule, was afraid "that political freedom might mean a return to Peshwa rule". In 1917; a delegation of the untouchables (now they are called the Dalits) met Edwin Montague, Secretary of State of India, and expressed their concern: "We should fight to the last drop of our blood against any attempt to transfer the seat of authority in this country from British hands to the so-called high caste Hindus." Similarly, all those ethnic or religious minorities that flourished under the British rule were not in favour of independence such as Parsis, Anglo- Indians, and the Christians. Included in this group were the rulers of the native states whose number exceeded more than 500. They were loyalists and pro-British. One can also count the landlords against the freedom struggle. They were collaborators of the Raj and as such were protected and rewarded by the government.

It shows that during the movement for freedom, masses were only involved in serving the cause of the elite classes in the name of the nation and national interests while the leaders negotiated around the table how to get political concessions. In the provincial election of 1946 when the freedom struggle was at its height and independence was within reach, 75 per cent of the adult population was excluded from the vote on the pretext that they were not literate or did not have enough property.

The result was that the common people who participated in the Quit India movement, the agricultural labourers who were the victims of the Bengal famine of 1943, and other property less

labourers and peasants were denied a role in the election. In his study *Muslims nationalism, and the Partition*, S. Kuwajima writes that there were two people's movements: "The movement against the trial of the Indian National Army in November 1925 and February 1946, and the Royal Indian navy strike in February 1946. But the Congress and the Muslim League had already decided to contest the election...and on the occasion of RIN strike both Congress and League advised the naval ratings to surrender, and promised to solve constitutionally the problems that they were facing."

Both the Congress and the League discouraged and opposed people's movements whenever their interest and their leadership was in danger.

Partition is also interpreted as the clash of personalities. Gandhi and Jinnah both came into conflict as a result of their political and personal ambitions. Finding it difficult to respond the tactics of Gandhi, Jinnah decided to carve his own political role in the Muslim League which subsequently struggled for a separate homeland for the Muslims. In another perception of Partition, Girilal Jain described it as "a victory of Hindu civilization" because it ended the "stalemate between the Hindus and the Muslims in favour of the Hindus in three-fourths of undivided India."

On the other hand it is said that Partition is "a withdrawal of the Muslim community from the Indian subcontinent". In a sense they left their rich Cultural heritage in India and confined themselves to a limited area. Some historians doubt that Jinnah genuinely wanted a separate homeland. To them it was just a card to get more concessions for the Muslims. His acceptance of the Cabinet Mission Plan is the proof of his readiness to remain within the united India. By accepting the plan, he wanted to protect the interest of those Muslims who were in a minority in the Hindu dominated provinces.

Recently, some historians have begun to probe new sources to write the history of Partition. They base their writings on literature and interviews of those who experienced the ordeal of Partition. These writings also focus on gender, children and the Dalits. Urvashi Butalia's *The other side of violence* and Ritu Menon's Border and boundaries deal with women and Partition.

Alok Bhalla translated the stories on Partition written in Urdu and Hindi into English in three volumes Stories about the *Partition of India*. The stories show the intense feelings of those who experienced the killings, rape, abduction, and loot and plunder during Partition. Through the mirror of this literature, Partition appears as a holocaust and catastrophe. One must remember it in order not to repeat it.

In Pakistan the historiography of Partition has been completely distorted when it is said that the demand for a new homeland was to establish an Islamic state. Analyzing the movement, Hamza Alavi calls it an effort of the 'salariat Muslim class' and the landlord of Sindh and Punjab who wanted to have a separate Muslim homeland for the protection of their interests and privileges. The correct perspective of Partition is very important to determine the future of Pakistan.

Gandhi and Indian Nationalism

Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness; it invents nations when they do not exist.—Ernest Gellner

In the nineteenth century nationalism emerged in Europe as a great and vital force and changed the whole course of history by transforming its society and culture. It ended the universalism of the Christianity and replaced it with the nation-state; it pushed religion to the private sphere of an individual's life and shifted the loyalty of people from faith to nation.

Such was the force and energy of nationalism that it made the European nations concentrate their energies and intellectual capacities on reconstructing their history and culture and determine their identity. As a result of cultural revivalism, the fragmented groups were integrated and shaped into one nation.

The process of nation-making is beautifully described by B. Andersen in his path-breaking book, "The Imagined Communities" (1983). The book reveals the way in which "print capitalism" combined the scattered groups and transformed them into a nation. However, like any other ideology, nationalism also remained fluid and changed according to the need of different societies. In Europe, in the nineteenth century, it played the role of homogenizing people and uniting countries.

For example, it helped in the unification of Italy and Germany. But it also generated and strengthened colonialism and imperialism because as a result of the rivalry among European nation-states, there was competition to acquire more colonies and political power. Ruling classes of these states exploited the nationalist sentiments of the people and used them in expanding their overseas territories. However, when the ideology of nationalism was introduced to the colonies, the colonial people used it as a tool to fight against their masters and subsequently liberated themselves from colonial clutches.

. There is now plenty of literature on nationalism in general and particularly related to different regions and countries. Scholars are also investigating the role of nationalism in the context of Indian society. For example, nationalist historians are proving that, historically and culturally, Indian society was/is one, irrespective of religious, ethnic, and regional differences. The Cambridge historians, in order to justify the colonial rule, are diffusing the impact of nationalism and highlighting the regional interests which, according to them, were contrary to national interests. The Subaltern historians saw the interests of the elite classes in the nationalist movement whose interest was different from the common, people .The Marxists points out how class interests were ignored by the nationalists with the result that independence proved fruitless to the oppressed and have not.

G. Aloysius, belonging to the Subaltern school of history, reviews the role of nationalism in his book "Nationalism without a Nation in India" (1997). He points out the difference between European and Indian nationalism. The former was a political nationalism which emerged against feudalism and developed under industrialism when bourgeois classes undermined the influence of feudal and liberated serfs from their bondage. Therefore, European nationalism was related to industrialisation and democracy while Indian nationalism, on the contrary, was cultural in origin.

It evolved by reviving the past culture and traditions. This cultural nationalism in the Indian context meant the supremacy of Brahmanism in which masses were culturally excluded but territorially included. It was in the interest of the upper castes to give equal status to the lower castes. Therefore, in India, there was no conflict between the bourgeois and the feudals. On the other hand, both joined with each other for common interest and kept the lower castes aloof from politics.

This clearly shows the difference between political and cultural nationalism: political nationalism was the champion of democracy, equality of citizens, mobility of classes, choice of professions, right of education, religion, ownership of land, share in government, and freedom in public space. Contrary to it, cultural nationalism in India denied all political, religious, and

educational rights to the untouchables and excluded them from all privileges which a citizen enjoys in a democratic society.

He critically examines Nehru's "Discovery of India" which, in his opinion, glorifies the Brahmanic traditions of the past. Nehru romanticized the Indian village, family, and the continuity of Indian history which means justification of the caste system and the superior role of the Brahmans. He highly admires the Gupta period which strengthened the Varana (colour) and Brahmanism. That is why it is called by the traditional historians the golden period of Indian history.

Nehru also downgrades the Muslim rule on the basis that they did not bring with them any high culture and therefore failed to change Indian society. On the other hand, he praises British rule which, in his opinion, initiates the process of modernization in India.

This version of history was challenged by the scholars of the lower castes such as Jotiba Phuley, Ramaswamy Naicker, Ambedker, and Swami Achchitanand, who were against Vedas, Upanishads, Furans, and Itihasas. They termed Brahmanism as poison to the lower castes. Opposing Ramrajiya, which was nothing but an attempt to reestablish and rejuvenate Brahmanism, they struggled to popularize Ravan Rajiya and Bali Rajiya which suited the oppressed castes. Also opposing the Aryan period, they glorified the pre-Aryan society which was free from caste and colour discrimination.

Beside the lower castes, there was also problem for the Muslim how to reconcile with the Brahminical past and accept the concept of Ramrajiya. On the Muslim reaction to Indian cultural nationalism, the author writes: "The Muslim middle class…struggled for a long time without working out an alternate vision for themselves. Their demand all along had been political nationalist in nature, demanding acceptance and encouragement of their emergence as much as the other lower castes, yet they were participating in the political activities of the cultural nationalists, struggling within them for a fair share of social and political power. However, when it became clear that integration within the nation-state was preconditioned by the acceptance of a peripheral position within the nation they began their search for

greener pasture using their rich religious traditions, myths and memories."

Aloysius then points out how with the emergence of Gandhi, dying movement of upper castes found the most active and ardent supporter. He cleverly used religious symbols and religious sentiments to uphold the supremacy of Brahmanism and diffused the influence of anti-Brahminical movements by launching three pronged activities: cow protection, usurping the untotuchable movement and taking charge of the Khilafat Tahrik. By these acts, he protected the upper caste by reviving the Brahminical symbols, discrediting the leadership of the untouchables and assumed leadership to improve their condition within the framework of religion; and created a sense of religious identity among the Muslim community by promoting the leadership of the Ulema. However, he was even then afraid that "untouchable hooligans will make common cause with Muslim hooligans and kill caste Hindus." The religious nationalism of Gandhi changed Indian national struggle, as Aloysius writes: "Since Khilafat and Non-Cooperation, vertical mobilization of Hindu and Muslim communities became the dominant discourse of nationalism, submerging the struggling discourse of social mobility, education, diversification of occupation by the lower castes."

Gandhi used the masses to achieve his end but not to create poltical or social consciousness among them. Tagore failed to understand how *charkha* should bring in any change in the life of the people. Aloysius writes: "the very meaninglessness of the activity had the potentially to yield a maximum catch and generate enough euphoria without bringing in any issue vital to the life struggle of the masses. *Khaddar and Charkha* succeeded in mobilizing the peasants to the extent that they were given something to be occupied with, which did not threaten the status quo but helped to contain the antagonism between communities. The masses were expected to weave their way to Swaraj while the upper classes played politics."

Gandhi kept the masses away from active politics. He never made any direct contact with the people but always through the local leadership which consisted of the upper castes. By doing this he strengthened their role in politics and social life

of the region. His policy of non-violence shows that "the endemic tendency of the masses and the perennial preaching of non-violence both reveal the fact that the masses had already been driven to a situation in which violence had become inevitable for even a marginal amelioration of conditions."

Gandhi's concept of Ramrajiya and his romanticizing of the Brahminical Indian past had no place for the lower castes. He believed in *vernasharma*, and trusteeship of the upper castes which was against the principal of equality, merit, and mobility of castes. That's why Ambedkar, the leader of the untouchables, vehemently opposed this type of Gandhian vision and says, "Speaking for the servile classes I have no doubt that what they expect to happen in a sovereign and free India is a complete destruction of Brahmanism as a philosophy of life and as a social order. If I may say so, the servile classes do not care for social amelioration. The want and poverty which has been their lot is nothing to them compared to the insult and indignity which they have to bear as a result of a vicious social order." Gandhi wanted to revive, uphold and preserve the same social order in the name of Indian nationalism.

In the end, Gandhi succeeded, while Ambedkar failed. India became independent with the help of nationalism but remains without a nation. This is how Aloyaus concludes.

Moving ahead in a Circle

Historians point out four movements of history: cyclic, pendulum, seesaw, and arrow. In the cyclic movement history repeats itself; there is no outlet or salvation to those who are in a circle and in the words of Syntayana, they are condemned to repeat it. Moreover, there is no freedom to the encircled nations and societies to act innovatively. They become stuck in prisons of time that narrows their vision, limits their thinking and makes their actions faulty. Their creative activities are strangled as a result of this movement.

In case of pendulum, the movement of history swings either in right or left direction. There is no other choice. Seesaw movement indicates rise and fall of civilizations, nations, and political dynasties. In the case of arrow movement, history goes ahead, sometimes without any hindrance and sometimes with some obstacles. However, it goes on and signifies progress.

The three movements, excluding arrow, keep a society confined to a limited circle and area and do not allow it to move forward or to get rid of repetition. Only in the case of arrow movement can the society liberate itself from stagnation and act creatively.

The question is: is there any historical determinism to compel any nation or society to act under certain specific movement or is there no restriction and societies are free to choose their own movements?

History shows that nations passed through these movements and changed the course on their own as a result of their efforts and struggle. In the medieval period, European society too was in a cyclic circle. It moved forward only when it changed the structure of the society and, instead of feudal lords, merchants and traders wielded power and liberated it from stagnation and launched a movement to discover the world. The same happened in case of Japan; the Meiji Revolution changed the movement of the Japanese society from cyclic to arrow

which resulted in its advancement and making it an industrial power.

In case of Pakistan, there was a sort of pendulum movement and that too remained very brief and short-lived—with two parties and their leaders coming to power successively after the fall of Zia ul Haq. The pendulum soon stopped when the army intervened. There is no seesaw movement as there is no rise of the Pakistani nation. We have to wait for our fall until we rise. Similarly, there is no arrow movement, as society remains stagnate and unmoved.

Therefore, we can only understand our society under the dynamics of cyclic movement. An important indicator of this movement is the religious character of our society. Thus our people always think in term of revivalism and condemn any attempt to introduce modernity. It becomes their dream to hark back to the early days of religion. This yearning leads them to attempt to purify the society from all rituals and customs which they think are irreligious and polluted.

Historically, the Pakistani society is also in search of the 'golden past' and is constantly making attempts to resurrect it. Moreover, history is used to create myths—including the glorious ruling dynasties to Great Persons who changed the course of history. It is hoped that if the society retrieves the past and its glories, it can achieve the same status as was enjoyed in the past.

Cyclic movement remains strong in oral culture, while literate societies adopt linear movement. As majority of Pakistani people are illiterate, they are fascinated by the past and fail to see what is ahead. Again cyclic movement suits their psyche. It makes them satisfied as they are not involved in any way to change the society. With the passage of time, they have become passive spectators to follow in the footsteps of their leaders without challenging or asking questions.

The successive governments of Pakistan took full advantage of the cyclic movement and justified their unconstitutional and illegal rule. It is thus customary to accuse and discredit the past government in order to legitimize their own rule. Every newcomer reads the same text after assuming power with the same allegations and accusations to his

predecessor. Then bureaucracy takes charge of creating the image of new power-wielder as a popular leader, Radio, television, and newspapers repeat the same eulogical phrases that were used in the past. That is why the political jargon of Pakistan is the same—the same words, phrases, proverbs, and sentences are repeated unashamedly to the media. The bureaucracy uses the same methods and strategies to popularise the new leader.

And when it comes to holding public meetings, government employees and even school and college teachers are forced to attend. Sometimes, people are herded in buses and trucks and brought to the public meeting. The official intellectuals are ready to convince people to accept the new ruler as their saviour.

The cyclic movement suits politicians, bureaucracy, army, clerics, intellectuals, and even the majority of common people who are illiterate and depend on the appearance of some strongman to act as their saviour.

The tragedy of the Pakistani society is that agents of social change are weak, helpless, and without much support. They are not in a position to stop the cyclic movement and liberate people from the prison of circle and shoot arrow of progress to go ahead.

Madrasa: A Symbol of Extremism?

Instead of producing religious scholars who could interpret religion to the common people, the seminaries became centers of communal movements

In the process of development and expansion, when a religion becomes complex, it needs interpretation of its sacred texts and legal codes to be adjusted to the changing conditions. At this stage, society requires religious experts and well-versed scholars who can explain, interpret, and expound religious tenets to the people. The requirement to produce religious scholars is fulfilled by the religious schools known in the Christian world as seminaries and in the Muslim world as Madaris (singular Madrasa).

In the early history of Islam, religious knowledge was imparted either at the residence of an Alim (scholar) or in the Jamia' Masjid (congregation mosque) where students gathered near a pillar and attended the lectures of prominent Ulema. Emphasis was on the study of the Tradition of the Holy Prophet (Peace be upon him) rather than on other religious aspects. But, as the Muslim Empire expanded, social, political, and economic problems made jurisprudence (Fiqh) as the major discipline of study because the administration required a large strengthening number of Qazis (judges), Muftis (authority to issue edicts), and throughout Mohatasibs (ombudsmen). Therefore, the institution of Madrasa emerged in the 10th and 11th centuries, first in Khurasan affiliations and then all over Iran, Afghanistan and other parts of the tribal Central Asia. The institution was financially supported by Waqf (endowment) or by the donations of rulers and nobility. After the development of four schools of jurisprudence, a Madrasa either provided guidance for all the four or restricted itself only to one.

To counter the Fatimid propaganda of Ism'ailism throughout the Empire with emphasis on Shafa'i and Hanafi schools of jurisprudence, Nizamul Mulk (1063-1092), the Saljuqui minister, established a chain of Madaris in 12th century. The Hanbalis also opened such Madaris to teach and propagate their version of Islam. They also launched a campaign against other sects, which they considered heretics. Their extremism not only led them to criticise the governments of the day and force them to enforce their Fiqh but also inspired them to organise groups of fanatics to attack their antagonists and suppress such immoral activities as drinking of wine and free mixing of sexes. The Hanbalis were against the Shia and made attempts to disrupt their meetings and fought pitched battles against them whenever there were sectarian riots. They also condemned Mu'tazalli and Asha'ri theological schools. As a result, the whole religious atmosphere was polluted and people were divided into different factions.

The Madāris played a vital role in strengthening the sectarian division throughout the Muslim world so much so that the sectarian affiliations overpowered the tribal and family loyalties. Madaris became the centres of communal movements that were supported by their students as well as by the state officials and Ulema who graduated from these schools. How the rivalries of these Madaris created disturbances in the society, is evident from the example of Nishapur where in the 11th and 12th centuries, conflict surfaced between the Hanafi and the Shafa'i Madaris. In the words of Ira lapidus, the author of 'A History of Islamic Societies', 'The antagonism of two schools of law spread from disputes over control of teaching and judicial positions to competition for governmental support and to pitched battles in which large segments of the town and the surrounding rural populace were mobilised to fight for their group. As a result, Nishapur was physically and socially destroyed by the middle of the twelfth century.

Why did these Madaris produce extremists and narrow-minded students instead of enlightened and liberal people? The main cause was the sect-oriented curriculum of these Madaris, which denied the validity of other sects and ideologies. Secondly, there was no space for questioning and challenging

but simply accepting what a teacher taught and preached. Imitation rather than creativeness was the main characteristic of the syllabus. There was no encouragement for a student to give his opinion; he had to rely on the religious authorities and textual interpretations. There was no logic and rationality. He had to support his case on the basis of faith. A scholar of Baghdad, Abdul Latif (1231), advised the students that: "I commend you not to learn your sciences from books unaided, even though you may trust your ability to understand. Resort to professors for each science you seek to acquire....when you read a book, make every effort to learn it by heart and master its meaning. Imagine the book to have disappeared and that you can dispense with it, unaffected by its loss."

In India, a comprehensive curriculum of the Madrasa was prepared by Mulla Nizamuddin during the period of Aurangzeb to train and educate the students in the Hanafi Fiqh for the posts of Qazi, Mufti, and Mohtasib. It was known as 'Dars-i- Nizamiyya' and became a standard for the Indian Madaris. The change in the curriculum, however, took place when the Mughal Empire came to an end and the British power was established. The Deoband Madrasa, which was founded to respond the changing political, social, and economic condition, realised that the traditional syllabus was no more required in the new set-up as here was no demand for religious officials in the British government. That is why the new syllabus that was prepared by the Deoband authorities was the mixture of Manqul (Traditional), and Ma'aqul (Rational). Therefore, in the new syllabus, more emphasis was laid on the Hadith rather than the Fiqh. The most important teacher in Deoband used to be Shaikhul Hadith or head of the Hadith Department. The Madrasa was more inclined to educating leaders of prayers (Imams) or Waiz (Sermon deliverer), and religious teachers for the guidance of the Muslim community.

As the Deoband's version of Islam was revivalist and puritan, the other sects established their own Madaris to teach their interpretation of Islam. For example, the Brelvis, to propagate their sectarian theology opened a chain of schools throughout the Indian subcontinent. Other sects followed it. Subsequently, the Madaris of different sects soon created strong

communal feelings that led to time-to-time riots and disturbances.

Pakistan, since its creation, inherited this system that is entirely based on the public donations or on the patronage of some rich persons. In the decade of 1970s. the oil-rich Arab countries financially helped them promote their version of Islam. Further, they became financially strong when during Ziaul Haq period they got Zakat funds. Their certificates were also given recognition equal to those of secular educational institutions. This led them to get involved in political activities. Some of them founded their own political parties, aspiring to capture political power some day.

The emergence of the Taliban phenomenon in Afghanistan, their capture of political power and subsequently, their downfall show that the religious system of education in the Madaris has some inherent defects that should be reformed and corrected.

Moreover, one should also keep in mind that majority of Madrasa students belong to the poor and marginalized classes bereft of any privilege. Religion becomes the only mean of their livelihood; therefore, they protect it to protect themselves. Besides religious extremism, there is also class hatred that is channelised by religious zeal.

Who Will Reform Pakistan?

In the thirties of the seventeenth century, Puritan dissenters asked themselves whether, as a result of persecution by the king and Church of England, they should emigrate to the new world or to stay on and struggle to reform the immoral and corrupt society. A majority decided to stay back and, in spite of hardships and problems, resisted and struggled to change society. As a result of their efforts, English society became tolerant towards other religious minorities and transformed itself into an enlightened and liberal one.

The minority that emigrated to America kept their memories with the motherland for a time and then forgot all about it. They became part of a new society. It is evident from history that the decision of the majority to stay, sacrifice, change and reform society was correct. It saved society from total chaos and decline.

In another case, when the East India Company became a political power in India, there was a discussion in the Company's circles and among the thinkers and politicians of England about how to rule India. James Mill, a Utilitarian thinker, outlined his views about the concept of governance in his book The History of British India.

He writes: "in a state of extreme poverty, the motives which usually restrain from transgression; respect for the laws, dread of the laws, desire of the esteem and affection, dread of the contempt and abhorrence of mankind, sympathy with the pains and pleasures of our fellow creatures, lose their influence upon the human mind, while many of the appetites which prompt to wickedness acquire additional strength. If, therefore, the government of India would lessen the tendency to crime, which is manifested among its subjects to so extraordinary a degree, it must lessen the poverty which prevails among them to so extraordinary degree....Take little from them in the way of taxes; prevent them from injuring one another; and make no absurd

laws, to restrain them in the harmless disposal of their property and labour. Light taxes and good laws; nothing more is wanting for national and individual prosperity all over the globe."

In the first case, Pakistan is facing the phenomenon of emigration on a wider scale. Not only are unskilled and illiterate workers finding ways and means to leave the country to have a good life; even educated and professional people finding no scope in the country are leaving it and settling in the developed countries to secure their future.

Unfortunately, there is no discussion in our society on the question of emigration as a solution to all problems or staying and reforming society from within.

There is such pessimism that a majority of them think that it is a waste of time to make any attempt to reform it. In the opinion of a majority of people it is a hopeless case. As the professional and educated class decides to leave the country, it creates a vacuum that cannot be filled. Resultantly, society is becoming more backward and underdeveloped. That is why, from time to time, our government, finding no professional or experts, asks expatriates to come for a time being and rescue the country from crises.

The expatriates, who have settled abroad, still have some memories of and links to the motherland. Sometimes they have an identity crisis or hunger for their own culture. To satiate the cultural hunger, they frequently invite poets, musicians, and entertainers from Pakistan to relieve them of alienation in their adopted countries. The other group is professional ulema who are invited to revive and strengthen their religious identity.

To these expatriates who are eager to change and reform Pakistan from the outside, the agents of change are the ulema and religious parties of Pakistan. That is why they generously donate to them huge funds and strengthen orthodox and fanatical elements in the country. Even living in a modern democratic, secular, and liberal society, they fail to change their outlook about the hazards of politicizing, religion. By helping, patronizing, and financing the religious elements, they are playing a very active role in keeping Pakistan backward. Sadly, neither within the country nor abroad are the professional, intellectuals, and educated classes are attempting to change the

outdated and corrupt system. To them, the only solution is either to become a part of the system and derive benefits from it or emigrate and support fundamentalism and extremism as a solution of political, social, and economic ills. This leaves no room for changing or reforming society from within or from without.

Those who are wielding power and authority in the country have no vision about how to alleviate the people's sufferings and hardships. Their only interest is to levy more taxes and collect more money, without realizing that an unjust levying of taxes results in revolution or chaos.

For example, in England the main conflict between king and parliament revolved round who had the right to levy tax. In the end the king lost this privilege and parliament became a powerful institution. When the English parliament imposed taxes on the American colonies, they raised the slogan "No taxation without representation." They fought and won their independence.

In France, the revolution of 1789 occurred because of the disparity between the privileged and unprivileged classes. The nobility was exempted from taxation while the people had to pay all kinds of taxes. Liberty, equality, and fraternity was the slogan of the French revolutionaries. It was a bloody revolution, but it changed the course of history.

What James Mill wrote in the 19th century provides a solution: not alleviation, but abolition of poverty and lessening the burden of taxation. When a state appears as an enemy of the people, exploits and fleeces them and deprives them of their livelihood, then the people either become helpless and apathetic or revolt against the system. Our rulers, perhaps, are lucky that the people of Pakistan are feeling themselves helpless but at present have no urge to revolt. How long this will continue is difficult to say.

Rewriting History Texts books in India

When you are publishing a book, if there is something that is controversial, it's better to take it out (What Johnny Shouldn't Read, Yale University 1992)
There is controversy in India on the attempt by the present government to rewrite history textbooks. As a result of it, there is heated discussion and debate on this issue. The media is very active to bring it to the public notice. The discussion and debate show that there is ample space in a democratic system to challenge, resist and to accept or reject government's decisions. The debate on the question of rewriting history textbooks raises some very important and pertaining questions, which, as a matter of fact, also invite us to think about our history textbooks.

On the question of writing history textbooks, generally official perception is that textbooks should be used in order to inculcate state ideologies, ideas and thoughts that suit to state policies. Especially two elements are evident in nearly all history textbooks. One, to create deep sense of nationalism and patriotism among the young generation, and secondly, to glorify the role of national heroes in different periods of history with the emphasis to emulate them. Not realizing that national sentiments and glorification of heroes both create a false sense of nationalism and patriotism and a belief of their own righteousness that subsequently, throttles the spirit of investigation and an urge to challenge everything before accepting it?

Sometime the government in power argues that it is in the national interest to distort, ignore, hide, or delete facts because they are sensitive to some communities or sections of society. This approach raises some more questions. For example, should controversial issues be avoided in the textbooks? Or

should there be only one point of view and students are not allowed to know different interpretations of history?

History textbooks become a victim especially in an ideological state framework. When an ideology feels insecure from the internal and external challenges, it adopts methods of omission and deletion those facts · and events from history writings, which it thinks detrimental to its existence. The present Indian government is heavily loaded with the 'Hinduva' ideology. That is why it is trying hard to monopolize all those institutions that could be used to propagate and popularize its ideology. This has divided the Indian historians broadly into two groups: conservatives and liberals. As the BJP is the government in power, its affiliated historians have official support to put forward their version of history. In this process of rewriting history textbooks, some issues which have become controversial are: the practice of beef eating in the ancient period, the execution of Sikh Gru Tegh Bahadur, and the portrayal of the Jat community in history.

The BJP government insists that the historical fact of beef eating should not be mentioned because it contradicts with the present practice of its prohibition. This approach is challenged by the liberal historians who argue that history should not be studied in present context but should be analyzed by its evolutionary process of religious and cultural practices. There was a time when the Aryans as a pastoral community used to eat beef. The practice was abandoned when it was it transformed into an agriculture society in which cow became a useful animal. Their argument is that not only beef eating but also other social, cultural, and religious customs and rituals should be understood after having analyzed the changes in the process of history.

The other point of debate is that those facts of history that are sensitive to the followers of different religions or different ethnic communities should be deleted or not. For example, there is the case Tegh Bahadur, the Sikh Gru, who was executed by Aurangzeb. The explanation, based on the Mughal sources, is that he, in association with one Hafiz Adam, a follower of Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi, involved in plundering and looting which caused devastation and destruction to the Punjab. In the Sikh tradition his execution was due to the conspiracy of

his family who disputed his succession. The argument of the liberals is that history should be studied based on facts rather than on feelings and emotions. Therefore, the execution of Tegh Bahadur should be judged purely on solid historical evidence.

The third important issue is of Jats who have objection that they are portrayed as bandits and robbers. As this reference is unacceptable to the Jats, therefore, the, concerned ministry proposed that such references should be deleted. Murli Manohar Joshi, the union minister made it clear that any historical account that hurts "the feelings of people of any caste, religion, region, or language" will be removed from school textbooks. It means that history textbooks first should be approved by various religious and community leaders and then be prescribed. If this happens, the students would get a picture of the ancient and medieval past which is pure and clean with no black spot on it and where there were not conflicts, clashes, and controversies. It is hoped by the BJP ideologues that such a past would be useful to make young generation nationalist and patriotic Indian. However, to the liberal and enlightened historians, It is horrifying because" the omission of crucial facts and viewpoints limits profoundly the ways in which students come to view history events. Further, through one- dimensionality textbooks shield students from intellectual encountered with their world that would sharpen their critical ability.

The BJP government accuses that since 1947, the leftists and communist historians monopolized the history writings and projected their point of view. Now, it is their turn to present their version of history. As far as the presentation of different interpretations is concerned there is no dispute. Every school of historians has a right to interpret facts. But the concern is that facts should not be distorted or deleted. Once facts remain a part of history, historians and students could interpret them according to their own thinking. However, any attempt to make history a clean slate and then inscribe their own facts on it, is a crime. History is above from all feelings and sensitivities. It coolly deals facts whether they are liked by someone or not. The task of history is to provide tools to understand present in the light of past and not to understand past in the light of present.

In case of Pakistan, there is nothing to be leaned from India. We have already rewritten our history textbooks in a framework of our state ideology. The practice of omission and deletion is common practice of our historians. Our textbooks writers also took care of our religious and cultural sensitivities and completely avoided all such references. We, in Pakistan have perfect model of rewriting not only history textbooks but also history in general. Therefore, it is time for India to learn from us.

History and Hindutva Ideology

Murli Manohar Joshi, the Minister of Human Resource Development in the BJP government, recently in one of his interviews complained that why is there so much hue and cry among some liberal historians and intellectuals especially for history textbooks and not on textbooks of other social sciences?

In his response, the simple explanation is that any distortion, either in history or in social sciences, is an intellectual crime. But history, as compared to other disciplines, is a very sensitive as well as powerful subject because its understanding helps to shatter the well established myths, reduces the images of heroes and brings them down to the level of ordinary man, and changes the notion of the past which is used by powerful groups to sanctify their rule and legitimize their privileges.

Correct study of history also provides understanding of the historical process which makes and un-makes traditions and institutions. That is why history becomes a dangerous discipline to those who want to use its distorted version for their own interest. They like to confine it in a framework of their ideology in order to justify their present political agenda by portraying the past to their liking. Whenever, history is written under the shadow of ideology, distortion, omission and misinterpretation become the practice to gratify it.

In Pakistan,' we have observed such processes when historical writings are adjusted according to needs of officially propagated ideology. Since BJP's government came to power in India, it is also attempting to implement the Hindutva ideology in changing of history textbooks.

The Hindutva ideology was developed and popularised by V.D. Savarkar (d. 1966) who started his early career as a nationalist and ended as an extremist Hindu. According to him, "A Hindu means a person who regards this land of *Bharatvarsha*, from Indus to the seas, as his Fatherland as well as his holy land, that is the cradle land of his religion." This

definition of Hindu means that India has to be his *'pitribhumi'* (ancestral land) and his *'punyabhomi'* (land of his religion). This excludes Muslims as well as Christians from becoming loyal Indians as their holy lands are outside India. However, there was a problem that the Hindus were also not indigenous inhabitants as the Aryans were outsiders and came to India either as invaders or migrants. To solve this problem, it is required to change the facts of history. The *Hindutva* historians and ideologues claim that the Aryans invasion is a myth and that they were not foreigners but the indigenous people. On the contrary, it is argued that the Europeans and other Aryan people were migrants from India. It is also pointed out that the Dravidians were the early offshoots of the Vedic people.

David Farley, a supporter of the *Hindutva* ideology, rejects the arrival or the invasion of the Aryans. According to his arguments it is a myth that was created by the British in the 19th century to fulfil their political motives. On the basis of this they wanted to keep north and south India culturally divided as *Aryans* and *Dravidians*; it also justified their rule on the basis that foreigners always dominated India politically.

To adjust historical fact in the ideological frame is always problematic and can be done only after distorting them. It is interesting that how Savarkar tries to define the name of 'Hind'. He writes that, "It is quite probable that the great Indus was known as Hind to the original inhabitants of our land and owing to the vocal peculiarities of the Aryans it got changed into Sindhu. Thus Hindu would be the name that this land and the people inhabited it before the time so immemorial that even the *Vedic* name *Sindhu* is but a later and secondary form of it.

Historically, it is proved that the Aryans called the Indus as Sindhu which later on was named *Hind* by the Persians. The Arabs called the Indian subcontinent *al-Sindh wa al-Hind*. It is also proved by the historians that the Aryans is not a race but denotes to groups of people who spoke Indo-Aryan language and arrived to India in a series of migrations. However, to prove that the Aryans were the original inhabitants of India, the Hindutva historians claim that, the Harappan civilization was Aryan and not of the Dravidian origin.

There are serious implications of the Hindutva ideology and writing of history under its influence. Regarding Muslims non-Indian, it rejects the rule of the Muslim dynasties and instead of owning, tends to look the cultural heritage of the Sultanate and the Mughals as alien and therefore, unacceptable. The historical monuments of this period became symbols of humiliation that, urge them to demolish them as it happened in the case of Baburi Mosque. Or to convert them as the Hindu monument by falsifying history. As some claim that Taj Mahal was not built by Shahjahan but it was Hindu temple. This distorted picture of the past would poison the mind of people and would threaten the religious rights and equal rights as citizens of India or Muslims and Christians.

If India becomes a Hindu state, Pakistan and India both would poise against each other on the basis of two antithetical ideologies. Subsequently, a permanent strife would prevail in South. Asia. There is also a danger that both states, in order to purify their societies from foreign and alien elements, will launch a campaign against their opponents and establish dictatorial and fascist state apparatus.

With the process of history, there is such integration and acculturation that no nation could claim to be pure. Neither is it possible to exclude those that are regarded by the racist polluted parts of a nation. This experiment was made by the Nazis and failed. There is time to learn lessons from the past and deter to make similar experiments at the expense of human dignity. Falsification of history brings disastrous results to a society. It is high time for India and Pakistan to refrain from making history a victim of their ideologies.

BJP's New Version of History

The Indian government's bid to rewrite history textbooks draws flak from objective quarters

There is controversy in India on the attempt by the present government to rewrite history textbooks, which has generated a heated discussion on the issue. The media is very active to bring it to the public notice. The debate shows that there is ample space in a democratic system to challenge, resist and to accept or reject government decisions. The discussion on the question of rewriting history textbooks raises some very important and relevant questions, which, as a matter of fact, also invite us to think about our own history textbooks.

On the question of writing history textbooks, general official perception is that textbooks should be used in order to inculcate state ideologies, ideas and thoughts that suit state policies. Especially, two elements are evident in nearly all history textbooks. First, to create deep sense of nationalism and patriotism among the young generation, and second, to glorify the role of national heroes in different periods of history with the emphasis to emulate them. Not realising that national sentiments and glorification of heroes create a false sense of nationalism and patriotism and a belief of their own righteousness that strangle the spirit of investigation and an urge to challenge everything before accepting it.

Sometimes, the government in power argues that it is in the national interest to distort, ignore, hide, or delete facts because they are sensitive to some communities or sections of society. This approach raises some more questions. For example, should controversial issues be avoided in the textbooks? Or should there be only one point of view and students may not be allowed to know different interpretations of history?

History textbooks become victims especially in an ideological state framework. When an ideology feels insecure from the internal and external challenges, it adopts methods to

omit and delete the facts and events from history writings, which it thinks detrimental to its existence. The present Indian government is heavily loaded with the 'Hindutva' ideology. That is why it is trying hard to monopolise all those institutions that could be used to propagate and popularise its ideology. This has divided the historians broadly into two groups: conservatives and liberals. As the Bharatiya Janata Party is in power, its affiliated historians have official support to put forward their version of the past. In this process of rewriting history textbooks, some issues which have become controversial are: the practice of beef eating in the ancient period, the execution of Sikh Guru Tegh Bahadur, and the portrayal of the Jat community in history.

The BJP government insists that the historical fact of beef eating should not be mentioned because it contradicts with the present practice of its prohibition. This approach is challenged by the liberal historians, who argue that history should not be studied in present context but should be analysed by its evolutionary process of religious and cultural practices. There was a time when the Aryans as a pastoral community used to eat beef. The practice was abandoned when it transformed into an agricultural society in which cow became a useful animal. Their argument is that not only beef eating but also other social, cultural, and religious customs and rituals should be understood after having analysed the changes in the process of history.

The other point of debate is that whether the facts of history sensitive to the followers of different religions or ethnic communities should be deleted or not? For example, there is the case of Tegh Bahadur, the Sikh Guru, who was executed by Aurangzeb. The explanation, based on the Mughal sources, is that he, in association with one Hafiz Adam, a follower of Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi, was involved in plundering and looting, which caused devastation and destruction to the Punjab. In the Sikh tradition, his execution was due to the conspiracy of his family who disputed his succession. The argument of the liberals is that history should be based on facts rather than on feelings and emotions. Therefore, the execution of Tegh Bahadur should be judged purely on solid historical evidence.

The third important issue is of Jats, who object that they . are portrayed as bandits and robbers. As this reference is unacceptable to the Jats, therefore, the concerned ministry proposed that such references should be deleted. Murli ManoharJoshi, the union minister, made it clear that any historical account that hurts "the feelings of people of any caste, religion, region, or language" will be removed from school textbooks. It means that history textbooks first should be approved by various religious and community leaders and then prescribed. If this happens, the students would get a picture of the ancient and medieval past, which is clean with no black spot on it and where there were not conflicts, clashes, and controversies. It is hoped by the BJP ideologues that such a past would be useful to make young generation nationalist and patriotic Indians. However, to the liberal and enlightened historians, it is horrifying because "the omission of crucial facts and viewpoints limits profoundly the ways in which students come to view history events. Further, through one-dimensional textbooks shield, students make an intellectual encounter with their world that would sharpen their critical ability."

The BJP government accuses that since 1947, the leftists and communist historians monopolized the history writings and projected their point of view. Now, it is their turn to present their version of history. As far as the presentation of different interpretation is concerned there is no dispute. Every school of historians has a right to interpret facts. But the concern is that the facts should not be distorted or deleted. Once facts remain a part of history, historians and students could interpret them according their own thinking. However, any attempt to make history a clean slate and then inscribe their own facts on it, is a crime. History is above from all feelings and sensitivities. It coldly deals with facts whether someone likes them or not. The task of history is to provide tools to understand present in the light of past and not to understand past in the light of present.

In case of Pakistan, there is nothing to be learned from India. We have already rewritten our history textbooks in a framework of our state ideology. The practice of omission and deletion is common practice of our historians. Our textbooks writers also took care of our religious and cultural sensitivities

and completely avoided all such references. We in Pakistan have perfect model of rewriting not only history textbooks but also history in general. Therefore, it is time for India to learn from us.

Aryanization of India

Ruling classes and power seeking groups have always used history for their political interest. This subsequently leads distortion, omission, and misinterpretation of history. On one hand, disputes, discussions and debates make history a dynamic subject, but on the other hand it becomes a tool in the hands of those who wield power and manipulate it for their hidden or open agenda.

The Aryan factor in the history of India is an example in which the interested groups are involved to present it in the interests of their political motives. The British were the first who, in the nineteenth century, propounded the myth of the Aryan invasion in which fair-skinned invaders defeated the dark-skinned Dravidians. The Aryans, according to this theory, emerged as conquerors and racially more superior to the aborigine inhabitants. Supporting it, W.W. Hunter writes in the *Imperial Gazetteer of India* (1881) that, "Our earliest glimpses of India disclose two races struggling for the soil: one was fair-skinned people, which had lately entered by the north-western passes; a people of Aryan, literally of 'noble' lineage. The other were a race of lower type, who had long dwelt in the land, whom the lordly newcomers drove back before them into the mountains, or reduced to servitude on the plain."

This interpretation suited not only to the British but also to the upper caste Hindus. In case of the British, they legitimized their claim to rule over India as belonging to the Indo-Aryan race. The upper castes, believing the veracity of this theory, asserted that India was the original cradle of human civilization. Based on this assumption, B.G. Tilak assigned *Vedas* to the third millennium while A.C. Das placed some of the hymns to the geological epoch.

The whole myth of the Aryan invasion is challenged by some of the historians. Firstly, it is pointed out that the clash was not between superior or inferior races as historical evidence

shows that the Dravidian people were more civilized than the Aryans as they produced Harrapa, a highly advanced civilization. On the contrary, the Aryans were pastoral people and culturally far behind the Dravidians. Secondly, it is too simple to say that the Aryan conquerors, after defeating their adversaries, pushed them to the south and as such there was no integration or interaction between these two groups of people and both remained separate, socially and culturally. Indian historians, including Romila Thapar, challenge the whole concept of the invasion and proved that instead of invasion, the language Indo-Aryan had come with a series of migrations "and therefore involving multiple avenues of the acculturation of peoples."

Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, the author of 'Lokayata' refutes the myth of Aryanization of India on hard historical facts. According to him, the majority of the Indian people were non-Aryan. He quotes numerous examples in which he has proved that India was not always ruled by the upper castes belonging to the Aryans. In the process of history, the low caste people assumed power and acquired the status of rulers. However, such was the cultural and psychological domination of the Aryans that: "The rulers would try to establish pure Aryan descent for themselves."

For example, the *Mauravs* were not Aryan. But to get legitimacy and recognition, they Aryanized themselves. The recent example is of Shivaji who belonged to *sudra* caste, but at the time of his coronation, he had to change his caste and for this purpose "a very learned *pandit* of Banaras, but of Maratha descent, was invited to give an opinion that Shivaji was a *varatya-kstriya* (Fallen kstriya) and that if he was purified acceding to the injunctions of *sastras*, the ceremony of coronation might be performed. For fifteen days poor Shivaji had to undergo all sorts of purificatory rites and then he has anointed king."

A.C. Dutta in his book *'Peasantry of Bengal'* proves that the majority of the Bengalis were not Aryan: "The Aryan conquerors of Bengal, after spreading their religion throughout the region did not and could not exterminate the aboriginal tillers of the soil. It stands to reason to suppose that, while the brave and the fierce aborigines retired to the wild and fastness of

Bengal the weaker population accepted the religion of the conquerors and maintained, as they were before, the cultivation of the soil."

On the basis of 1871-72 census, Chattophyaya proves that the majority of the tribal population is non-Aryan. In the ancient past attempts were made to integrate these tribes to the Aryan fold. For example, Kautilya, in Arthasastra, suggests using all methods such as woman, wine and poison to bring these tribes under the empire. However, successive empires were not able to subdue these tribes and failed to bring them under their control. They persistently continued to retain their independence. The existence of vast number of tribes clearly proves that it is nothing but a myth to say that whole India was Aryanized."

The recent interpretation about the Aryans is based on the *Hindutva* ideology which rejects invasion as well as migration theories and claims that in fact the Aryans were the original inhabitants of India and from there they migrated to different parts of world and spread the Indian civilization. This theory suits the followers of *Hindutva* who exclude the Muslims and Christians from their fold as foreigners. This leads them to distort history and manipulate facts to prove their point of view. As BJP is in power, they are trying to use political power to change history by rewriting history textbooks.

The attempt to use history for political agenda is not new. For example, in Nazi Germany, the myth of Aryan superiority was built officially but it collapsed with the fall of their government. In South Africa, history was written with racial point of view that has changed after the end of white supremacy. India and Pakistan must realize that distortion of history to suit their political designs would be disastrous for both. Time has come to liberate history from ideologies and set it free to play its healthy.

A Past of One's Own Choice

It was the practice of the Mughal emperors to appoint a court historian to write the history of their rule. As an official historiographer, he had to write what pleased the king and omit all those that were not liked by him or did not suit his administration. Though there were some clever historians who successfully mentioned those events between the lines that were not allowed to be known otherwise. That is why Kruchev once called historians "dangerous, and capable of turning everything topsy-turvy. They have to be watched".

Aurangzeb, the shrewd and astute Mughal ruler, long before this saying by Kruchev, realised it and after 10 year of his reign abolished the post of court historian. Modern researchers of the Mughal period are puzzled on this decision and make attempts to find out the reason. Some say that the reason behind this act was that Aurangzeb was afraid of history because of his political crimes. Others say that he was a pious man and did not like to be eulogised by the historians. Whatever may be the reason, one thing however is obvious that powerful groups have always attempted to use history for their projection and glorification, subsequently leading either to the distortion of facts or to the omission of important events.

But such attempts are not confined to the monarchies of the old. With the advent of nation state historians, instead of writing about kings and monarchs, are now supposed to write in favour of their nations' interests and twist history in such a way as to promote nationalism and patriotism. They are also supposed to project heroes and denigrate traitors.

To write history in national interest, they are required to omit, delete, and falsify facts. A recent example of this type of historiography we find in India where Bharatia Janta Party (BJP) and the followers of Hindutva are attempting to rewrite history textbooks in an ideological framework. The BJP government in Delhi accuses left leaning historians as 'Intellectual terrorists'

and asserts that it is determined to make history ideologised according to Hindutva. The proponents of this amended history project argue that controversial issues should be omitted because school students are not mature enough to understand the complexities of historical events. Secondly, they say, the events which create any doubt in the young minds regarding state and nation and subsequently weaken their patriotism should also not be mentioned. And thirdly, according to them, mentioning the issues which hurt feelings of any religious or social group should also be avoided.

When we analyse the composition of history in the light of these arguments, we find out that it cannot be written without controversy. There are conflicts and controversies among nations and communities; there are wars, riots, and bloody skirmishes in every part of the world; there are religious clashes, political disputes, and number of other controversial events which a historian has to mention in order to discuss, interpret and analyse.

Without controversy, in fact, there is no history. Readers of history must know about these clashes in order to understand the circumstances of their lives. We are living in a present that is full of problems and conflicts. How can we convince the students of history that the past was peaceful and there were no problems, no class or caste conflict and no political upheavals? On the contrary, it is important to present all past controversial issues to the readers so that they may understand their causes and make attempts to solve them in the light of past experiences.

Again it is a wrong approach to use history for the promotion of patriotism because such an approach helps ruling classes hide their past mistakes. A 'patriotic' version of history creates false notion of racial superiority with generations after generations ceasing to learn anything from others assuming themselves to be perfect. Moreover, they tend to think that they have already achieved everything and there's nothing new to learn.

History, in its character, is neutral and does not care for sensibilities of caste, class or any social or political group. It does not care about the feelings of people. All it needs to do is to worry about the veracity of facts. Its task is to present without

omissions whatever happened in the past. While writing Indian history, a historian, therefore, has to write about the caste system and its effects on the untouchables. If mentioning the exploitation of castes or classes is avoided, history would remain incomplete.

But attempts to change history textbooks is nothing new in India. An earlier attempt was made when Janta Dal came to power under J Parkash Narayan after defeating Indra Gandhi in the 70s. The attempt failed then because of the opposition from Indian historians.

There is also a strong and persisting resistance from professional and academic historians to the current attempt by the BJP government to revise history books. They are challenging the shortcomings and the falsifications being included in the new syllabus. For example, Professor Irfan Habib comments: "Strangely enough, the syllabus has one unit devoted to efforts of Chanakya to bring geographical and political unity. No such attempt is attributed to Sultans and Mughals. This is nothing but perpetrating false cinema history."

Professor Habib further points out: "In modern history, while formation of Israel has been included, there is no mention of Vietnam and the Korean war." Besides these there are a number of distortions which historians have pointed out, warning the government that a distorted history would bring disastrous result for the multicultural and multi-religious Indian society. However, it remains to be seen as to who succeeds in driving their point home the historians or the government.

But as was the case with kings and monarchs appointing their official historians, the BJP's attempt is a clear example as to how powerful groups manipulate history: sometime its writing and teaching is abolished altogether, disallowing everybody to record their misdeeds; sometime it is falsified and doctored to propagate an ideology as superior to all others. As a result, history suffers immensely.

But it has the tenacity to survive. No matter hampered how much, it is finally able to reveal the truth and thus pose a threat to the ruling classes and powerful groups.

Religion, State And Education

Education that is inspired by rigid ideology or dogma becomes a danger to the stability of a society. Education in the West suffered at the hands of ideological states but western society resisted such efforts and kept it free from authoritarian control. In Pakistan the ideological structure still controls education

Education in the West as well as in/the East passed through two stages: in the early medieval period it was monopolised by religious authorities; after the emergence of nation states, realising its utility and impact, the state took control of education and moulded minds of young people according to its needs. In the modern democratic age, there is a demand that education should be free from religion and state control and be allowed to play an independent role.

In the medieval period, both in Europe and in the Islamic world, there was non-institutional dissemination of knowledge. Individual scholars were the centres of education and pupils used to come from different parts of countries to learn from them. L. Fisher, writing in his *A History of Europe* (1949) on the state of education during this period comments "The student of the twelfth century was like the Crusader, a pilgrim, travelling light and travelling often in quest of the Holy Grail of knowledge. Since there were no endowments to chain him to a particular place, since teaching was oral, and Latin was the common language of the clerk all over the western world, teachers and pupils alike would wander from town to town and country to country."

The aristocratic classes had contempt for educated men who were regarded too soft and cultured to face hardships of life. Moreover, as aristocracy wielded power and possessed wealth, they employed learned men to administer their affairs.

In the Christian world when the church emerged as the most powerful religious institution, it controlled education in

order to check secular and heretic ideas. Nearly all-present day universities of Europe were religious seminaries where clergy was educated and trained to keep the society obedient to religion.

Renaissance in Italy brought some changes in the structure of educational institutions, where as a result of commercial activities secular subjects were introduced in some of the universities. In Florence alone from eight to ten thousand students were studying mathematics and philosophy. The other major breakthrough was the Reformation, which divided the Christian society into two sects.

Under new religious and political atmosphere, the curriculum of both Protestant and Catholic universities changed. In the Catholic universities more emphasis was on cannon law, while Protestant universities introduced civil law in accordance with the growing needs of civil society. However, still both sects suspected natural sciences. Protestant religion, in contrast with Catholicism, changed the outlook of man. Personal salvation required an individual to study the Bible himself without any help from a priest or any religious authority. These individual experiments paved the way for the independence of mind. Sceptism led educated men to discover different branches of knowledge and find out the truth by himself.

Moreover, the Protestant church had no such authority as was enjoyed by the Catholic Church through means like censorship, inquisition, and the index of banned books. Therefore, slowly and gradually, education liberated itself from religious control in Protestant countries but still remained a slave of the church in the Catholic countries.

With the emergence of the nation states in Europe, education became the victim of state control. Curriculum was designed in such a way as to serve the state and its rulers. More emphasis was given to natural sciences because they helped the state to increase its material and military power. One example is that of Napoleon who supported physical sciences, fine arts, mathematics but discouraged moral and political sciences. He, by issuing a decree in 1803, closed the departments dealing with these subjects. Napoleon's model was followed later on by ideological and dictatorial states in Europe as well as in Asia.

Parallel to European history, we find that in the early period of Islam, individual teachers gathered students around them and taught them religious or secular subjects. These scholars either got some financial help from the state or from endowments. In the eleventh century, religious education faced a conflict as a result of sectarian disputes. When the Fatemi caliphs established al-Azhar at al Qahira as an institution to train missionaries to propagate the Ismaili faith, the Sunni world responded by establishing Madrassa Nizamiyyia under the patronage of Nizamulk, the wazir of the Suljuq dynasty to counter the Ismaili faith.

However, these madaris remained confined only to religious education. For secular knowledge and training there were either professional guilds or individuals who on the relationship of Ustad (master) and Shagird (apprentice), trained young people professionally. Most of the time they kept their professional skills a secret as it was the source of their income and status. Owing to this, few books were written on engineering, architecture, medicine, or art and craft.

In India during the Sultanate and Mughal period, rulers did not take much interest in the education. A few madaris were established under the patronage of the state, otherwise education remained dependent either on endowment or some wealthy patron.

The main function of the madaris in India was to educate pupils in those subjects, which were required for the positions of *qazi*, *mufti*, and *sadr*, the religious offices at the Muslim courts. The famous curriculum known as 'Nizamiyy'; was designed by Mulla Nizamuddin during the period of Aurangzeb in order to provide religious officers to the court. Therefore, much emphasis was on Islamic jurisprudence. Later on in the Madrassa-i-Rahimiyya, which was founded by Shah Walliullah's father, emphasis was shifted from jurisprudence to the study of the holy Quran and the Tradition of the Prophet. This tradition was later on continued by Deoband in the modern period.

When the British introduced their educational system in India, different sections and groups of society opposed it. The upper castes refused to sit on the same benches on which the untouchables sat. To avoid it, a method was adopted in which

lower caste pupils were asked to sit in the verandah outside the class on the ground, while the upper caste students had the privilege to sit on the benches in classrooms.

The aristocrats also refused to send their children to schools. It was abhorrent to them to study with the commoners. Their plea was that for the education of their children they could hire the best teachers who individually taught the latter at their homes. The government then established chief schools and colleges for them. However, two parallel systems of education continued: one modern and Europeanised and the second religious and traditional. This indicated the two trends in our educational system, secular and religious.

Now, the question that arises is: why and how Europe was able to liberate its education from religion and successfully make it secular to fulfil the material demands of society; and why we have failed to make education useful for our society?

The answer is complex and lengthy. However, to make it simple and understandable, it is argued that two elements played a crucial role in changing the pattern of European education. First, growth of capitalism and industrialisation required expansion in knowledge to fulfil the needs of a new society. Second, slow and gradual development of democratic institutions that allowed people to take part in politics. Both factors weakened the domination of the church and promoted secular education, which could fulfil the material demands of society.

Freedom from all controls allowed intellectuals to express their views and ideas without any fear. However, education also suffered in the West when ideological states tried to use it for their strengthening and not for society. But western society resisted such efforts and succeeded in keeping it free from authoritarian control.

In Pakistan, from the very beginning, the ideological structure has controlled education without realising the dialectic development of knowledge. Old knowledge becomes obsolete and new knowledge takes its place. It is important not to imitate new knowledge but to create it. Those societies, which stick to the old knowledge in the name of tradition or ideology, lag far behind the other nations. If a society fails to create new

knowledge and does not contribute to human civilization, it also looses its respect in the comity of nations.

The Pakistani state is very much obstructive to new ideas which contradict its ideology; the result is that the Pakistani society failed to produce its own knowledge system that was required for its development and progress. On the one side there is the madrassa system, free from state control that is producing graduates unaware of modern knowledge. On the other hand there are state-controlled institutions which are producing ideological zealots unfit to respond to the challenges of the modern world. Education that is controlled and inspired by rigid ideology or dogma becomes a danger to the stability of a society.

Joint History Books?

During the mediaeval period in the West as well as in the East, education was controlled and monopolized either by the religious institutions or individuals. The state played no role in its promotion. In both Christian and Muslim societies, education was motivated to preach, defend and strengthen faith.

When Luther challenged the authority of the Pope the church, in order to defend itself, heavily relied on a systematic programme of education to refute the charges and to inculcate the true spirit of their version of religion. The Society of Jesuits, established in 1540, launched a very elaborate programme of education and defended Catholicism by supplying learned preachers and scholars.

The monopoly of the church on education was first challenged by the French Revolution {1789) which deprived the church of its hold on education. The National Convention (1792-95) set up educational institutions for the promotion of secular learning which was the need of the state—such as engineering, industry and art. The word 'national' was now attached to such institutions such as National Conservatory of Arts and Industries, "national" institute or "national" university, etc.

Realizing the importance of education, Napoleon, after coming to power in 1799, fully used state power to promote education in his own image. All educational institutions, higher or lower, were put under the control of the central government, and no one was allowed to open a school or teach in public unless the university licensed him. The University of France was given authority to maintain uniformity in the educational system. All the schools were required to take as the basis of their teaching the ethical principles of Christianity and loyalty to head of the state. For example, when asked what the duties of the Christians to their rulers were, the pupils were told to tell that as Christians they owed to the princes who governed them love,

respect, obedience, fidelity, military service, and taxes levied for the preservation and defence of the Empire and the throne.

The example of France was followed by other European states. Under the pressure of political, military and industrial competition they turned their attention towards mass education in order to use human resources for the development of their countries. For example, in nineteenth century, Britain was apprehensive of Prussia and north America because of their industrial development. Fearing any future challenge, she undertook education under her control and established schools throughout the country for mass education. Once education came under the control of the state, it was used to promote its interests, Nationalism, patriotism, images of heroes, and spirit of sacrifice for the nation were some elements which were inculcated in the minds of the pupils with the help of textbooks. The state prepared its own curriculum and prescribed its textbooks. The victim of the state textbook was the subject of history which was blatantly used to create false pride by distorting facts and manipulating historical narratives.

David Lowenthal correctly writes in The Past is Foreign Country: "The virtue of bygone heroes are likewise inflated. Admired forebears acquire qualities esteemed today, however anachronistic, and their faults are concealed or palliated. Popular modern depictions of Washington and Jefferson, for example, are utterly at variance with their lives as eighteen-century slave-holding planters..."

Though radical historians raised their voices again and again against the state-manipulated curriculum, it was of no avail as the state had proved to be more powerful than scholars. In 1990s the History Workshop Group in Britain remarked on the content of the British national curriculum as "triumphalist, Whiggish, document-driven and a parochial syllabus of British political and constitutional history, with an emphasis on rote learning of dates and 'facts' and an aversion to the historical imagination."

After decolonization, the newly independent nation states of Asia and Africa, following the model of European nation states, controlled the educational system and used it in their interest to promote the concept of one nation, one language,

and in some cases of one religion. Patriotism and loyalty to the "Founding Fathers" was the central theme of the history textbooks.

All emphasis was on glorifying national struggle, sacrifices of freedom fighters, and their ultimate victory over colonial powers. On the basis of this version of history, a particular class of politicians made an attempt to perpetuate the rule of their families. History textbooks were also used to create hostility against the neighbours to keep the country in a permanent sense of insecurity in order to relay on defence forces to protect them.

On this misuse of history, a historian writes: 'It fills people with false memories, exaggerates their reactions, exacerbates old grievances, and encourages either a delirium of grandeur or delusion of persecution. It makes whole nation bitter, arrogant, insufferable, and vainglorious.'

Patriotic and nationalistic versions of history played crucial role in most of the wars among European and Asian countries. The monuments and sites that were built in memory permanently remind humanity of destruction caused by wars. But even developed countries do not like to abandon memorials of their victories.

Recently when the European Parliament asked the British government to change the name of Waterloo station because it reminds everyone of the Napoleonic wars, the British government refused saying it was "salutary for the French to be constantly reminded of Wellington's great victory'. The British nation is not ready to lose Nelson's Column, Trafalgar Square, and Blenheim palace.

However, realizing the danger of nationalistic and chauvinistic history textbooks, an attempt was made by the historians of Germany and Poland to write joint history for school children. The project was successful because both governments were interested in it. There is, however, no possibility of making such experiments in the case of countries which are at daggers drawn against each other and regard their nationalist version of history raison d 'etre of their existence.

Keeping in view history textbooks in India and Pakistan which are poisoning the minds of the young generation, a

suggestion is often made for writing joint history textbooks as an alternative to official ones. To accomplish this project, there is need to bring together like-minded historians of both countries and discuss the parameters of writing and interpreting the past. There is a deep desire among the enlightened circles of both the countries that such history should be written because it would help the people of Pakistan and India to understand the political complexities of the recent past and realize the ulterior motives of the politicians and political parties and the ruling classes. This historical "correction" would certainly bring people together.

If any such attempt is made, it will certainly be a thrilling experience for historians on both sides. Such a venture will remove deep-rooted prejudices, cut down great heroes to their size, and bring to light shaded facts.